

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

It sometimes happens that a book brilliantly achieves an end subsidiary to that for which it was written. The *obiter dicta* may be more striking than the argument, or the conclusion may not seem to the reader to follow so inevitably from the premises as it does to the writer. But any book which compels men to do some hard thinking upon some vital issue has done valuable work, and such work is supremely needed to-day, when the world is facing vital issues on a vaster scale than it has ever faced before.

These reflections are suggested by a book entitled *The Peace Army*, by Mr. Henry BRINTON (Williams & Norgate; 2s. 6d. paper, 3s. 6d. cloth). The aim of the Peace Army, which, we are told on the jacket cover, is at present being organized, is the abolition of war. This army 'would have to be equipped with every means of defence, but no weapons of attack.' And this is how it is expected to work. 'Before hostilities actually broke out, we should have to announce that we were sending the "Peace Army" as a precautionary measure. It is possible that its landing would be opposed by force. If this were the case, there would be undoubtedly an awful slaughter. But that would probably be the end of the war. The knowledge of having killed thousands of men who had made no effort to defend themselves and who were only seeking to preserve their destroyers from war and destruction would be such a ghastly weight on the conscience of any nation that it seems incredible to believe that all the innate

feelings of decency of the people would not rise in revolt and lead to such a reaction against war that it would vanish for ever.' The more difficult case of the landing being unopposed is then discussed.

There are doubtless many who will be scarcely prepared to accept the idea or to believe in the efficacy of such a Peace Army, whose value, in Mr. BRINTON's words, would be 'purely psychological,' but even they can hardly fail to be inspired by the general argument of the book. It is written with intense conviction by a man who has probed the malady of our time in the spheres of economics and politics, and who believes that the so-called 'realists' have brought the world to the verge of ruin and that, if world-affairs are not speedily reconsidered in another spirit, we may not impossibly soon be over the verge, in a welter of civil war and international anarchy. A note of urgency runs through the book—'whatever action we take must be taken immediately, before it is too late.'

With much lucidity he analyses the situation created by the economic measures to which all countries are resorting, and by the Treaty of Versailles. It is not the province of this journal to deal with economic and political problems, but a book like this helps us to feel afresh how indispensable religion is to the happy and permanent solution of these problems. The morass in which all nations are floundering to-day is proof enough that the policy which has brought them to this pass is tragi-

cally unsound. We must all travel along a saner way, and that speedily, or we shall find ourselves in the abyss. That saner way, Mr. BRINTON makes bold to assert, is the Christian way—that, and that alone.

Advocates of the Christian solution have now the right to say to those who have ignored or rejected it: 'See what your policy has done for us; would it not now be wisdom and justice to try ours?' So Mr. BRINTON has written his book 'to advance arguments to show that the only hope for the future of civilization lies in the adoption of Christian principles,' or, as he puts it more explicitly elsewhere, 'to suggest that the world will be saved by turning to the way of Christ, not because it is swaying our emotions, but because it is appealing to our common sense in that His way, far from being impracticable, is the only practical way.'

Translated into more definite terms, the fundamental sin within the sphere of economics is economic nationalism, and the fundamental solution would be a recognition of our common brotherhood. The trouble is that our moral advance lags far behind our mechanical advance. We are living in a world unified by science, as the radio, the telegraph, and now even the telephone attest every moment of the day; but in our economic life we decline to recognize this undeniable fact. The industrial system has been built up on a system of exchange with other nations, but now each nation hopes to find salvation in its self-sufficiency; each is playing for its own hand, with the result that all are submerged in a common misery.

The same conflict between the conceptions of the independence and the interdependence of nations is evident in the political sphere. The League of Nations is a very noble attempt to stamp upon the consciousness of men and nations a sense of their solidarity and interdependence; but some of the provisions of the Peace treaties have created among the penalized nations a bitterness and exasperation which constitute a perpetual menace to the peace of the world until they are revised, if not in a spirit of magnanimity, at any rate in the direction of

simple justice. Twice Mr. BRINTON insists that the Peace Treaties 'have got to be revised.' In the political as in the economic sphere what is needed is 'to give effect to what has always been an ideal, namely, the brotherhood of man.'

The new wine has to be put into new bottles; the new bottles are as necessary as the new wine. Of two things Mr. BRINTON is assured: 'first, that a new system has got to be applied; second, that that system must be based upon Christianity.' Most public men will agree with his specific proposals that 'the war debts and reparations must be cancelled, and that tariffs will have to be lowered or dropped'—eventually, if not now. But more important than any specific proposals is the demand that 'a change will have to be brought about in the political atmosphere,' and that 'the change which has to take place is spiritual.' The new way must be the way of Jesus, 'the only way that leads to life'—the life of nations as of individual men.

Assuredly 'we have come,' as Mr. BRINTON says, 'to the cross-roads'; and if we do not take the way of Jesus, civilization will perish, as it deserves to perish. The end of a system in which each nation is striving to get the better of every other will be, not the survival of the fittest, but the survival of none. But in spite of Mr. BRINTON's painfully candid exposition of the world's present trouble, it is reassuring to find him conclude his book with these words: 'even if the days before us are dark, it is only with the darkness of a tunnel through which we must pass to the light of the sunshine, which, to those who have eyes to see, is already visible in the distance, full of promise and hope for the glorious day towards which we are moving.'

In his new book, *As I see Religion* (S.C.M.; 5s. net), the Rev. Harry Emerson Fosdick, D.D., has provided a good deal of challenging matter for the religious public to digest. In his anxiety to get alongside the 'outsider' he is perhaps a little hard on the average religious person. The Church contains a great many imperfectly moralized souls, it

is true, and a good deal of conventionality. But we are not all duds, morally and religiously, and one feels in reading this book a certain lack of proportion in its statements, while on the whole one is constrained to recognize its intense moral earnestness and the unpleasant truth of many of its criticisms of current religion.

Perhaps the most interesting part of the book is its last chapter, 'Morals secede from the Union.' The future of religion is not being decided on the scientific front, says Dr. FOSDICK. A far more critical battle is being waged on the ethical front, where morals are denying that they need religion, and are seceding from the union. This is a decided revolution, for as far back as history goes morals and religion have been mingled, or, rather, closely knit together. But to-day the age-long ideas of morality's dependence on religion have collapsed. The old idea, for example, that morals depended on supernatural rewards and punishments is gone. Similarly, the morality that depended on fear of a future Hell is gone. And even the moral conduct that depended on a supernatural code is getting rarer every day. 'Thou shalt not commit adultery' is excellent morals. But the one thing this generation will not do is to accept even that on supernatural authority.

But the secession of morals from their historic union with religion is much more thoroughgoing than the mere denial of supernal codes and sanctions. What is being said to-day is that religious faith is only the shadow which earthly ideas of goodness, developed out of human relationships, have cast upon the sky. This is the true chronology of ethics and religion we are told. First, from practical earthly experience we discover what is good, and then we imagine back of the cosmos a Figure whose goodness is like our own. Neither our initial ideas of goodness nor our motives in achieving it came from the Figure. He is a shadow, and when the shadow vanishes nothing serious has happened to the good life itself. And so, with God regarded as an after-thought, neither creative of the good nor necessary to sustain it, let us cease worrying about theism, and give up asking whether the universe has a moral

purpose at the heart of it. There may be no cosmic purpose, but there are many good purposes on earth for which to live. There may be no good God, but all the goodness still is left from which our ideas of the good God were derived.

What is Dr. FOSDICK's answer to this modern plea? Well, first of all, it is a *tu quoque*. If faith in God can be psychologically explained, so can atheism! There seems to be a native kinship between atheism and discouragement. Dr. FOSDICK states as the conclusion of his experience as a minister that very little atheism springs merely or mainly from sceptical philosophy. It is, for the most part, emotionally caused. It translates into terms of a godless, purposeless, ruthless world an inner experience of grief, frustration, or fear; or, as in Russia, it is the theoretical echo of practical resentments and revulsions. 'I happen to know that one of the most popular, persuasive, and ruthless statements of atheism in modern times comes from a man battling with a fatal disease, and that this book represents primarily the way he feels about life.' That is one of the striking illustrations Dr. FOSDICK gives of his point. And so, he concludes, as rationalizations of our wishes, theism and atheism are on all fours. Yet one of them must be true!

Dr. FOSDICK's next point is that irreligion seems deeply to affect *morale*. 'I do not see how any one acquainted with modern life and literature can avoid observing the constant, consistent, and logical kinship between thoroughgoing irreligion and lowered enthusiasm about life.' You cannot keep theory and practice apart. Whatever a man *really* believes, really and not conventionally, does always affect his conduct. If a man has any faith about the meaning of the cosmos he cannot keep it from splashing over into his *morale*. How can any one help being influenced in his total response to the meaning of life and his attitude to it by his belief about the cosmos? After all, morals are not simply paying one's bills, obeying traffic regulations, or returning borrowed umbrellas. Our morals, at their deepest, are our innermost response to life, our spiritual quality, taste and motive—and that, separated from our total philosophy, is as unreal as the smile

abstracted from the face of the cat in *Alice in Wonderland*.

But that is not all. Much current talk about morals without religion proceeds upon the incredible assumption that there can be serious discussion of what man ought to be without serious discussion of what man is. *Oughtness* is essentially related to *isness*, and on that simple fact the endeavour of morals to secede from religion will in the end wreck itself. For while morals deal with what men ought to do and be, religion is basically a message about what men are. To suppose that morals can blithely wave farewell to this basic problem regarding what man is, that the Ideal for man is unrelated to the Fact about man, is to disregard obvious human experience. 'There is a deep tendency in human nature to *become like* that which we imagine ourselves to be.'

Dr. FOSDICK quotes an amazingly frank confession of his moral creed from an avowed atheist. 'To me,' writes this ingenuous disbeliever, 'pleasure and my own personal happiness—only infrequently collaborating with that of others—are all I deem worth a hoot. . . . As a matter of fact, the happiness and welfare of mankind are not my profession; I am perfectly willing to leave them to the care of the professional missionaries of one sort or another; I have all that I can do to look out for my own happiness and welfare. . . . I am against all reforms and reformers. The world, as I see it, is sufficiently gay, beautiful and happy as it stands.' This seems the logical issue of an irreligious view of the world. If we are bits of organic scum, 'parasites infesting the epidermis of a midge among the planets,' why should we live on any different level from that suggested by our real nature?

The basic reason why morals never will succeed in seceding from religion is the impossibility of disuniting *ought* from *is*. 'Ought' is essentially our sense of the possible resident in the actual and crying out to be fulfilled. And of the essential truth of this there are abundant examples in history and in experience. As a matter of fact, however, one main reason why the good life is so anxious to

secede from its ancient union with religion is the narrow and negative ethical ideals in the churches. Here Dr. FOSDICK takes up again his sharp lance for a tilt at conventional religion. And he asserts that only if our religion can be made intelligently and seriously ethical, so that it becomes the germinative source of our best ideals, only then will the case for religion's indispensable service to morals be convincingly won.

Even so, however, morals do not have the last word with Dr. FOSDICK. The good life, he says, inevitably tends to become religious. Valuing goodness, men become uneasy in believing that the Creative Power means nothing by it. All passionate goodness is forever unreconciled to an ethically senseless world. Non-theistic humanists, trying to content themselves with thin slogans, like 'Morals minus Religion,' would better take the measure of this towering fact. They can have morals minus religion—for a while. But in the end they will be hoist with their own petard. The very goodness they have achieved, the more serious it is, will the more certainly press up into religion, and religion with its sustaining resources will press back into it, and the two blend in one response to life's meaning as a whole.

In *Jesus came Preaching* (Scribner's; 8s. 6d. net) Dr. George A. BUTTRICK of the Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York, has published his Lyman Beecher Lectures, delivered in April of last year at the Divinity School of Yale University. The book is a very fresh and attractive presentation of what Christian preaching in the new age is or should be. It is not concerned so much with the preacher's technique as with the content of his message to our times. Accordingly the craftsmanship and even the personality of the preacher are subordinated in the treatment to the subjects of the authority of Christ for the preacher, and the preaching of Christ to the society and to the individual of to-day. The attractiveness of the book is enhanced by apt quotations in prose and poetry, some of them old, many of them new.

An analysis of the chapter entitled 'Is Christ still the Preacher's Authority?' will serve to show the style and temper of this writer. He begins with the point that the apostolic preaching had but one Word—Christ, from whom all other words derived their life. There was no other name in earth or heaven. 'The night of pagan cults had a thousand stars; the day of the apostles' gospel had but one Sun.'

But our age has scant respect for tradition, and the authority of Jesus is often called in question. Even supposing, it is asked, we knew incontrovertibly His words and life, are they valid for this our day? 'Can words addressed to Capernaum in Aramaic sound anything but faint and far when addressed in translation to Los Angeles or New York?' 'Why should life be made conformable to a Craftsman in the dim-blue hills of ancient Galilee?' It is the writer's conviction that Christ is still the preacher's credential and his sovereign power.

What, then, is authority? Operating with the paradoxical definition of authority as 'a compulsion safeguarding our freedom, a finality challenging us by an unknown,' the writer asks the question, Does Jesus meet both terms of the paradox? Is He compulsion and is He quest? Undoubtedly Jesus had compulsion, a finality which yet honoured freedom, for those who walked with Him in the days of

old. But has He the same compulsion for us? Perhaps we do not know in dead certainty that His faith is final, but we do know in 'invincible surmise.' No other name has ever won such diverse allegiance. No other face is a 'Face like all men's faces.' No other voice speaks to every man 'in his own tongue.' He has become mankind's other self. The soul stands at salute when He passes by.

Yet He is not merely compulsion or finality. There is no thwarting of our human freedom. 'In Him authority comes clothed in its immemorial paradox.' When others offer their careful maxims or lifeless rules, He challenges our poor judgment: 'What think ye? Whom say ye that I am? Why judge ye not of yourselves?' And His authority is in the last resort the compulsion of a quest. It is the authority of a venture of faith. It bids us launch out into the deep—'into a life of nations such as this blood-bespattered planet has not yet known; into the building of a Church that will put our dingy tabernacles to shame; into a vigil and rigour of prayer before which our perfunctory repetitions will cower in self-loathing.'

To-day, as in the day of the Apostles, Christian preaching has that one Word from which all other words derive their life. 'The cults of *our* day have in their night a thousand stars; *our* gospel has but one Sun.'

The Barthian School.

IV.

Rudolf Bultmann.

BY PROFESSOR VINCENT TAYLOR, PH.D., D.D., WESLEY COLLEGE, HEADINGLEY, LEEDS.

WHEN the student of Bultmann's works first learns that their learned author has Barthian sympathies, he is inclined to ask: 'Is Saul also among the prophets?' Especially is this the case if he has first read *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*, either in its original form (1921) or in the second

edition (1931). Bultmann's critical results give little ground for such an expectation; they are radical to a degree, and so much so that they have not unfairly been compared with those of D. F. Strauss.

Bultmann is one of the foremost leaders in what

has come to be known as the *formgeschichtliche* school. While the method of this school is not necessarily sceptical in its tendencies, it is definitely in this direction that Bultmann's work moves. Of the forty-four short narratives in the Synoptic Gospels which he calls *Apophthegmata* only three or four appear to him to be historical accounts; in the remainder he believes that words of Jesus have been given an imaginative setting by the Christian community. Towards the words of Jesus in these stories, as distinct from the narrative setting, and towards the sayings generally his attitude is more favourable; but many of these are explained as 'community-products,' as Jewish wisdom-words erroneously ascribed to Jesus, or as Hellenistic formations. Most of the miracle-stories are viewed as imaginative sketches, meant to serve as proofs of the Messiahship and divinity of Jesus; the narratives in general, including those of the Resurrection, are 'legends'; and only a brief outline of the Passion Story, consisting of the Arrest, Trial, Condemnation, and Execution, remains after investigation as the historical nucleus of the whole.¹

In such a critic we do not expect to find a prophet of Reformation theology, and yet it is undoubtedly true that in Bultmann's *Jesus*, a short volume of two hundred pages, published in 1925, we do find many ideas which remind us of the Barthians. The attitude of the leading members of this school is, of course, far from being Fundamentalist. Brunner, for example, has expressly said: 'I myself am an adherent of a rather radical school of Biblical criticism, which, for example, does not accept the Gospel of John as an historical source, and which finds legends in many parts of the synoptic gospels.'² In a school where paradox runs riot, one more need not surprise us, but even the most detached mind cannot fail to raise the question whether Bultmann's 'Barthianism' has any real connexion with his criticism, or whether it is but a kind of glow which vainly attempts to conceal the ravages of 'scepticism.' This difficulty should not prevent us from doing full justice to his *Jesus*, which is one of the most interesting and important studies of recent years.

The aim of the book is to describe the teaching rather than the life and personality of Jesus. Echoes of radical criticism are still audible; but

while many of the words of Jesus are treated as 'community-products,' they are none the less used as evidence for His teaching. The method by which this is accomplished is interesting. We are bluntly told that a saying is not historical, but that none the less the invention of the community is highly significant. A sentence like: 'Nevertheless, in this point the procedure of the community is the best witness for the teaching of Jesus,'³ indicates the point of view. The exposition is powerful and moving, and one by one ideas with which Barth, Brunner, and Gogarten have made us familiar are found in the mind and teaching of the historical Jesus.

I.

Bultmann finds the note of crisis and the sense of urgency clearly present in the message of Jesus, especially in His eschatological teaching concerning the inbreaking of the Kingdom of God. For the sake of the Kingdom everything must be renounced; man is met with a call to repentance and is confronted with a moment of decision in which he must decide one way or the other (*Entweder—Oder*) for God or the world. In fixing on this element as central, Bultmann is true to himself, for it is just sayings of this kind which, in his *Geschichte*, he accepts as having the strongest historical foundation. He urges that by the Kingdom Jesus did not mean any kind of 'highest good' which a man may set as his goal and approach by a series of gradual ascents. The Kingdom is a supernatural entity, and from first to last is the work of God. Like His contemporaries, Jesus expected a kind of eschatological drama, but He neither depicted the punishments of Hell nor sketched gorgeous pictures of heavenly lordship. The emphasis in His teaching does not lie on the manner in which the Kingdom will come, but upon its nearness, and the consequent necessity of decision on the part of men. In proclaiming this necessity His thoughts transcended national limitations, but, Bultmann maintains, they stopped short of universalism. His belief was rather that the Jew *as such* had no claim before God; the Kingdom was for the Elect, and though these are known to God alone, it was by his own decision that a man showed whether he belonged to the Elect or the Rejected.

Jesus rejected every kind of mysticism; He did not look on man with the eyes of a Stoic; nor, again, did He behold him in the light of the Hellenistic dualism of flesh and spirit. On the contrary, for

¹ I have discussed these points more fully in a series of Lectures shortly to be published under the title, *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition* (Macmillan & Co.).

² *The Theology of Crisis*, p. 41.

³ *Jesus*, p. 72.

Him the nature of man was found in the *will*, in man's free activity, and the only attitude towards God which He knew was that of *obedience*. It was not the world which was bad but man, and it was the bad will which made man evil. The worth of man was not embedded in some diffused human quality, but in his action in the Here and Now of his existence. 'Only what man does now gives him his value.'¹

One of the outstanding difficulties which those who have emphasized the eschatological element in the teaching have found, is solved by Bultmann in a manner which is not only ingenious, but is fully in accord with his fundamental conceptions. I refer to the difficulty of giving the eschatological hope a *present* significance, and of showing how Jesus could at the same time be an apocalyptic herald and an ethical teacher. In the mind of Jesus the hope determined the present because it compelled men to make a decision, and this decision was both ethical and spiritual. Bultmann is not wholly satisfied with the view that fulfilling the will of God was the condition which Jesus laid down for sharing in the blessings of the Kingdom, for if this had been the foundation element in His message, it would have threatened the radical character of the obedience on which He insisted. Accordingly, he looks for a solution in another direction. He is not prepared to solve the problem by the view that the eschatological message was put into the mouth of Jesus by the community. 'The certainty with which the community puts the eschatological message into the mouth of Jesus is hard to understand if He did not actually proclaim it.'² Moreover, the movement which Jesus developed, His entry into Jerusalem, and His end on the Cross are historically intelligible only if He emerged as a Messianic prophet.³ Just as strenuously does Bultmann reject the opposite contention that the ethical teaching of Jesus and His preaching about the will of God do not spring from Him. If the community saw in Jesus the Messiah, it is not credible that it transformed Him into the Rabbi. Further, the oldest community at Jerusalem held with great fidelity to the Law, and 'it cannot be doubted that the most important words which demand radical obedience under God's will go back to Jesus.'⁴ Along with this contention, Bultmann rejects the view of J. Weiss and A. Schweitzer that the teaching is to be understood as an *Interims-Ethic*,⁵ which applies only to

the brief period which antedates the inbreaking of the Kingdom.

Bultmann's contention is that in reality our difficulty springs from our own inability to grasp the character both of the Eschatology and the ethical demand of Jesus. To effect a union is quite impossible so long as we think of an Ethic of Jesus in the usual sense; for the common view assumes that the world and mankind really are as we see them, that purposes are realized through our own actions, and that there is a future standing at our disposal for the realization of the ideal. All this, Bultmann says, is expressly denied in the eschatological message of Jesus; His message 'knows no ends of our actions, but only God's purpose; it knows no future pertaining to man, but only God's future.'⁶ Both the message of the Coming of the Kingdom and the preaching of the Will of God point man to his Now as the last hour, the moment of final decision, and thus both form a unity; indeed the one requires the other.⁷

In a similar manner Bultmann explains how it is that Jesus has nothing to say about the details of moral activity, why He did not speak of the Kingdom as a social order, why He sketched no programme for the shaping of the world, why He spoke no word about the value of marriage, or of work, or of the State. For Jesus, Bultmann holds, the moment of activity contains all that is necessary for the decision;⁸ the man himself knows what he must do, and this, not on the ground of experience or rational principles, but 'out of the situation of the Now.'⁹ The Sermon on the Mount does not preach an ethical idealism, but sets the absolute character of God's demand in the light. The man who is unwilling to dissolve an impossible marriage, or is ready to offer the other cheek to the striker, because of the words of Jesus, has not understood Him; for it is not a question of satisfying an external authority, but of being wholly obedient. Jesus leaves the concrete demands of the Love-command undefined because He begins with God and not with man. The man decides his action by renouncing claims of his own, and by obeying the command of love and 'if the man really loves, he knows already what he must do.'¹⁰ Whether this exposition is satisfactory to us, is not the issue; Bultmann would urge that this is the point of view from which we must understand the ethical teaching of Jesus.

¹ *Jesus*, p. 52.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 115.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 119; *Die Erforschung der synoptischen Evangelien* (1930), p. 39.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 114.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 116.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 120.

⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 121.

⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 83.

⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 83.

¹⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 88.

II.

From what has already been said it will be seen that while Bultmann emphasizes the place which the eschatological hope has in the message of Jesus, he finds its real significance in the decision which man is called upon to make: the supreme question is whether he will be obedient to the will of God. Like the Rabbis, Jesus found the will of God embodied in the Law, but for Him the authority of the Law did not lie in the fact that its commands were prescribed; the content of the command was a matter of vital importance. Indeed, as we see from His treatment of the question of divorce, it was the content which determined whether a word of Scripture was a command of God. Jesus, therefore, did not ask for a blind obedience; but, on this account, the obedience He required was all the more radically conceived. Blind obedience easily leads to a doctrine of merit, and there is no room for this in man's true attitude to God. The radical obedience Jesus demanded was one in which a man 'himself affirms what is asked of him,' one in which the man is wholly present in what he does.¹ It is true that Jesus introduced into His teaching the idea of reward, but the rewards He promised were for those who were obedient irrespective of reward.² The idea of reward, indeed, distinguishes His standpoint from that of idealistic Ethics. His teaching knows nothing of doing good for the sake of the good, nothing of personality and its virtues, nothing of humanistic or social Ethics. 'Always it is the single man alone before the will of God that He sees.'³

In all this the central place given to the will of God is manifest, but it is characteristic of Bultmann's exposition that he shows that in the teaching of Jesus God is both *far* and *near*. The conception of the 'far God' appears in later Jewish teaching in the custom of using designations like 'heaven,' 'majesty,' and 'glory' as names for God, while the idea of the 'near God' is expressed in the creation-idea which emphasizes man's dependence on God, and in the conviction that God is the Lord of human history who bends the course of events from the beginning to the fulfilment of His purposes. Jesus also held these ideas of the 'far God' and the 'near God,' but He effected a union between them in a degree which far surpassed that attempted by Judaism. Judaism sought to unite the God of the future and the God of the present through the practice of prayer and the thought of God as the future judge of the present. Jesus also taught these

things, but in themselves they do not effect the union desired. Fearing the future when he will stand before God, man loses the consciousness of standing before God here and now, and the confession of sin and penitent prayer easily come to be looked upon as 'good works.' God's grace tends to be regarded as a kindly overlooking of sin and as standing over against His justice, whereas, radically considered, the grace of God belongs inseparably to His judicial righteousness; His grace does not overlook sin, but forgives it.

All this, of course, is good Reformation teaching, and Bultmann believes that it is involved in the message of Jesus, and that by means of it the ideas of the 'far God' and the 'near God' become really one. God's aloofness is conditioned by sin; His nearness is revealed in the act of forgiveness.⁴ Prayer is in no way inconsistent with the attitude of obedience, since the latter is complete only when we reveal our wishes before God and confess them to Him in the spirit of 'Not as I will, but as thou wilt.'⁵ Man, indeed, must pray to God in order to be obedient. But it is especially through faith that God becomes the 'near God.' For Jesus faith is not right knowledge about God, but the power to deal seriously in the decisive moments of life with the conviction of God's omnipotence; it is the certainty that in such moments man will experience God's action; the conviction that He really is the 'near God' if man will but renounce his usual attitude, and is truly ready to behold Him. Only when we are obedient can we believe in this way.⁶

It is remarkable how often in Bultmann's exposition this reference to the attitude of obedience emerges. Love itself is brought by him under this category, and its Godward aspect is treated as determinative. 'As I can love my neighbour only when I surrender my will wholly to God, so I can love God only in that I will what He wills, in that I really love my neighbour.'⁷ Love is not a feeling, but a definite attitude of the will.

As 'near,' God is the Father and men His children.⁸ But Jesus does not think of men as God's sons by nature, but rather, as in Judaism, through God's free choice and the action to which He points them. Sonship is a marvel, not something to be taken for granted. The prodigal in the far country is a 'lost son,' but while he is there sonship is a judgment, and, when he comes to himself, it is a

⁴ The paradox of the 'far God' who is also the 'near God' constantly appears in the teaching of Jesus, in His miracle-faith, and in His belief in prayer.

⁵ Jesus, p. 172.

⁷ Op. cit., p. 106.

⁶ Op. cit., p. 175.

⁸ Op. cit., p. 175.

¹ Jesus, p. 73.

² Op. cit., p. 75.

³ Op. cit., p. 80.

pain. He bases no claim upon it,¹ but believes in the forgiving love of his father; and it is forgiveness which makes him truly a son.

III.

Perhaps the most distinctive part of Bultmann's exposition is his treatment of sin and forgiveness. Jesus, he reminds us, did not speculate about the universality of sin or its inheritance; He did not think of sin as something dwelling within man, but as that which characterizes the sinner himself. His notion of sin corresponded to His conception of God's claim. Man cannot comfort or justify himself with the idea that his sin is a frailty or a lapse; his sin is not a stage in his moral evolution, something which in a sense is the material for further moral progress. 'He stands before God as a sinner, that is, his sin has not a relative but an absolute character.'²

In *Der Begriff der Offenbarung im NT* (1929), Bultmann describes sin as the self-glorification and self-trust of the natural man, his forgetfulness that he is a creature, his rebellion against God in whose place he puts himself.²

The ideas which Jesus held concerning grace and forgiveness were not new, but like His conception of sin, were more radically conceived than those of Judaism. The Parable of the Pharisee and the Publican shows this clearly. The true nature of God's grace appears when man is completely silent and sees nothing in himself to which he can appeal; in partaking of it, he passes the deepest judgment of all upon himself and humbles himself truly before God. His sin means that he has failed and has lost his freedom. Forgiveness means that through God's grace he has become a new being and has regained his freedom to choose a life of obedience. This forgiveness is a happening, an event, just as it is in human relationships, not something to be reckoned with or inferred from our estimate of God. It is a boon, a gift of God, not sacramental grace which imparts a new nature, but God's personal action which makes the obedience of man possible.³

The final question concerns the criterion by which the assurance of forgiveness is gained. This, Bultmann contends, cannot be a psychical experience; nor can it be an event in the world of external objects, since in forgiveness the action cannot be seen. Ecclesiastical tradition is wrong in thinking of the Crucifixion and Resurrection of Jesus as acts of redemption if it thinks of them

as historical events which can be confirmed by observation; for to do this is to take up the attitude of a spectator, and the result is that the action seen is no longer that of forgiveness. Jesus did not point to anything by which a man can be certain of God's forgiveness; He proclaimed it, and for the truth of His word offered no guarantee in miracles or in His own Person. Yet there is an estimation of His Person which corresponds to His purpose; namely, that He is sent by God and is the 'bearer (*Träger*) of the Word.' 'In the Word he assures men of the forgiveness of God.'⁴ Bultmann admits that this is unintelligible so long as we think of the term 'Word' as the expression of the one who speaks, but maintains that in its original sense, as relating to conditions which lie outside the speaker, the Word can be a happening for the hearer in that it makes these circumstances known. In the Word and in nothing else does Jesus bring the forgiveness. The truth of His Word, and whether He is sent by God, constitute the decision which the hearer is called upon to make.

IV.

I have thought it well to supply this account of Bultmann's *Jesus*, because the book is not only one of very great interest, but is also a unique example of Barthian teaching. The strong emphasis on the sovereignty of God, the radical conception of sin, the account of the disturbed relations between God and man effected by sin, the stressing of God's demand for obedience and for instant decision, and the thought of forgiveness as His gift, are all ideas on which the Barthians love to dwell.⁵ The special interest of Bultmann's work is that he finds these ideas in the teaching of the historical Jesus. The Jesus presented is an intense but remote figure, comparable in some respects to the figure of Muhammad. This is due to over-concentration on the peremptory elements which certainly belong to the teaching of Jesus but do not represent the whole. But, while this is so, it must also be said that Bultmann succeeds in bringing his account of the teaching appreciably nearer to that of the New Testament Epistles, and

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 199.

⁵ To these ideas we must add the conception of Revelation as developed in *Der Begriff der Offenbarung im NT* (1929), in which Bultmann argues that the New Testament does not find Revelation in teaching or enlightenment or knowledge, but in the fact of Christ, in the preaching of the Word and in faith. Cf. pp. 20-31.

¹ *Jesus*, p. 182.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 32 f.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 193.

that his exposition is immeasurably superior to that of Liberal-Christianity.

The question which arises is not so much whether Bultmann rightly finds Barthian conceptions in the message of Jesus, but whether, as a radical critic, he has a right to find them there.

It would be unjust to explain his Barthianism as a fire kindled on the ashes of radical criticism, for all along Bultmann has been more ready to find an historical element in the words of Jesus than in the Gospel narratives, and he has been especially friendly to just those elements in the teaching which have most affinities with the theology of Barth. In accepting the eschatological sayings, and at the same time refusing to think of the ethical sayings as an *Interims-Ethic*, he foreshadowed the developments which appear in his *Jesus*. His critical results were already reached before he came under the influence of Barthian teaching, and are not modified in the 1931 edition of his *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition* to any appreciable degree. It may therefore be interesting, but it is in no way portentous that the theology of Crisis has made a strong appeal to his mind, and that he occupies a definite, though peculiar place in the Barthian School. It is no doubt possible to argue that so radical a critic cannot justly reach positive results, and that if so many sayings are 'community-products,' he is not entitled to rely on the passages which he selects as evidence for the teaching of Jesus. But Bultmann himself supplies an answer sufficiently valid for his purpose in the contention that the thought of the primitive community is the best of evidence that Jesus taught this or that. Of course, if we press this argument further, his sceptical estimate of the Gospel tradition is seriously undermined, but that Bultmann does not take this course does not affect the validity of such positive results as he is able to affirm, and he cannot, therefore, be said to be inconsistent.

While, however, Bultmann is a Barthian, there are notable differences between him and the other leading members of the school. When we read Barth, or Brunner, or Gogarten, we feel that we are reading about real issues between God and the soul, and of a revelation which has actually broken into history in the Person of Jesus Christ. When we read Bultmann, we receive confirmation from an unexpected quarter that these ideas are rooted in the Gospels and in the New Testament as a whole; but whether they are true remains an open question. On this all-important point our

uncertainty is not relieved by the perfectly just contention that the decision is one which the hearer must make for himself. On what grounds will he make the decision? If it is not to be made on the basis of history or an inner experience, what is the alternative? There is, I think, a sense of strain in Bultmann's discussion of this issue. The farthest point to which he will go is that Jesus was a prophet and 'the bearer of the Word'; but even this limited estimate remains a challenge to faith rather than an express historical statement.

H. Windisch has justly pointed out that the statement, 'Jesus was the bearer of the Word,' seems not much but is already a Christology, and that in very different ways it can be developed and deepened both religiously and speculatively.¹ This is true, and it will be of the greatest interest to see in time to come what use the cautious Bultmann will make of his own phrase. Along with this, another opinion may be mentioned which he expresses by the way. After remarking that Jesus did not speak of His Death and Resurrection as redemptive acts, Bultmann remarks: 'Admittedly, this would not mean that others could not speak of them as matters which concern Redemption (*Heilstatsachen*), so far as they can speak of these as of events in which they become certain of the divine forgiveness.'² Here, again, is a statement capable of development and deepening in various ways; but it remains at present a seed by the wayside.

Perhaps it is healthy for us to listen to a theology which stakes so much on faith and is almost scornful of a Christianity which wants to know Christ 'after the flesh.' To many of us, however, this emphasis is one-sided and neglects deep religious and historical interests. Even the Barthians are not without anxiety regarding the historical scepticism of their brilliant ally, and yet he is only an extreme example of their own tendency to ascribe a minor interest to events in the life of Christ previous to the Resurrection.³ It would not be right, however, to end this survey with a note of criticism, for, radical as they are, Bultmann's works are serious and valuable contributions to our understanding of Gospel Origins, and his *Jesus*, if not a religious classic, is one of the most stimulating studies of our time.

¹ *Die Absolutheit des Johannesevangeliums*, p. 54.

² *Jesus*, p. 196.

³ Cf. R. Birch Hoyle, *The Teaching of Karl Barth*, pp. 201-214; J. Arundel Chapman, *The Theology of Karl Barth*, p. 29.

Mysticism, East and West.¹

BY THE REVEREND NICOL MACNICOL, D.LITT., D.D., EDINBURGH.

A BOOK by Dr. Rudolf Otto bearing the above title has just been published in an English translation. The author describes his work as 'an attempt to penetrate the nature of that strange spiritual phenomenon which we call mysticism by comparing the two principal classic types of Eastern and Western mystical experience.' His studies have led him to give much attention to the element of awe in religion, and so have naturally drawn him towards mysticism, since mysticism, however we may define it further, may be accepted in general as giving us, as Edward Caird says, 'religion in its most concentrated and exclusive form.' Dr. Otto's interest in the numinous has indeed led him in various directions. Because of it he has experimented with forms of worship and given much thought especially to the religious value and significance of the Lord's Supper. It may seem surprising that alongside of these subjects of study, which would appear to be wide enough in their range, Professor Otto has found time to make himself acquainted with Sanscrit and the religious literature of Hinduism. Perhaps, however, it is his interest in mysticism which has drawn him in this direction also, for in the opinion of some students of the subject the whole mystical movement had its origin in India.² In Śāṅkara he has found 'the classic representative' of what, he tells us, 'is regarded by many as the classic form of mysticism.' He has accordingly chosen him to represent Eastern mysticism, and Eckhart to represent Western mysticism, and has given us in this book a valuable study of the mystical experience as revealed in the kindred and yet profoundly differing insights of these two thinkers. Śāṅkarācārya, it will be remembered, is the great interpreter of Indian Vedānta who, early in the nineteenth century of our era, elaborated in his writings that system of Advaita which has held ever since a powerful control over the mind of Hinduism. Meister Eckhart is described by Dr. Otto as 'in the deeper sense' a contemporary of the earlier master, though his actual date is 1250 to 1327.

¹ *Mysticism, East and West: A Comparative Analysis of the Nature of Mysticism*, by Rudolf Otto, Professor of Theology in the University of Marburg (Macmillan; 16s. net).

² That appears to be the view of Professor Oman. See his *The Natural and the Supernatural*, p. 495.

It is well that we should begin by making clear what Dr. Otto means by the much misused word, mystic. He is quite definite in his statements. 'The basic meaning of *mystēs* is not "the unified," but *epoptēs* . . . the "seer" in whom the *intuitus mysticus* has dawned and who perceives the "wholly other"—be it *ātman* or *Brahman* or unity or *Śūnyatā* or soul or modeless Godhead or One indivisible—and who lives in this vision' (p. 141). As we are left in ignorance of what exactly the *intuitus mysticus* means, this does not appear to be a completely valid definition, but perhaps it carries us as far in this region as can be expected. But Dr. Otto further emphasizes what may be considered to be implied in the words quoted, namely, 'the wholly non-rational character of its conception of God.' 'Mysticism enters into the religious experience . . . to the extent to which its hidden, non-rational, numinous elements predominate and determine the emotional life' (p. 141). In other definitions it is usually 'interiority' that is considered the central element in mystical experience. Here it is its non-rational character that is so regarded; its God must be 'Deus sine modis.'

It might appear that this conception of mysticism was to a considerable extent in agreement with that of Dr. Oman as expressed in his recent book on *The Natural and the Supernatural*. There he affirms that 'in the strict sense there is no such thing as a Christian mystic, because in so far as there is use of a historical revelation and of a Church with its cult, fellowship, and active service of others, the religion is not mystical' (p. 420). Would Dr. Oman, it may be asked, deny the title of mystic to one who travels by the road of revelation and by the use of cult and the experience of fellowship to a supra-rational region where there is alleged to be direct intuition of 'the Wholly Other,' the modeless One? That at least is the type of mystic 'knowledge' of which Eckhart and even Śāṅkara are representative.

But, perhaps, it will be our wiser course to leave aside questions that concern the nature and characteristics of this ambiguous word, and instead, to examine what it is that produces this thing, so named, in Śāṅkara, and wherein Eckhart resembles him and yet is in the end so different. If it be the case that Brahman speculation is the actual

ancestor of Eckhart's mystical doctrines, then it will be worth while to see whether that heritage is a blessing or a curse, and, if a curse, wherein its evil lies and how Eckhart escaped from it still a Christian.

How near Eckhart came to losing hold of the Christian faith by reason of his mystical speculations is indicated throughout the first part of Dr. Otto's book where he demonstrates the close approximation of Eckhart's views with those of Śāṅkara. Some of Eckhart's most startling statements may be quoted. 'It is as wrong to call God Being as to call the sun pale or black.' 'No distinction can exist or be intelligible in God Himself.' 'If I declared God good, it is as if I declared white black.' But not only do we find 'the qualityless Brahman' in Eckhart, but we find also that, like Śāṅkara, he holds that all creatures are 'purum nihil.' 'Eckhart,' Dr. Otto says, 'approaches within a hairbreadth of Śāṅkara's *māyā* doctrine.' Further, for Eckhart, as for Śāṅkara, the soul, the ātman, is as central as God or Brahman. Indeed, they approximate to identity. 'Were I not, neither would God be.' When one traces these parallels between the two doctrines and listens to Eckhart's 'numinous rapture,' it cannot greatly surprise us that the Dominican monk, 'so much loved by Hegel when in his full pantheistic moods,'¹ was condemned by Pope John xxii. He certainly seems to approach the very edge of the abyss.

But why should we reckon that what Eckhart is approaching is the abyss? The second part of Dr. Otto's study deals with 'The Differences: Eckhart *versus* Śāṅkara.' Perhaps in the earlier part of his book he seems to be surrendering too many of Eckhart's positions to the 'acosmic pantheism' of the Indian thinker, but he now calls a halt and makes plain to us that Eckhart, in spite of appearances to the contrary, is still deeply and impregnably Christian. In spite of appearances to the contrary, Eckhart's religion is still Christian, because it centres in a God who becomes incarnate, a temporal order that is rooted in reality, and a sinful humanity saved by the Divine grace.

It is difficult to agree altogether with Dr. Otto in his insistence on the 'common theistic foundation' of Śāṅkara and Eckhart. Śāṅkara may climb to Brahman by the ladder of *Īśvara* (the Lord), but he undoubtedly kicks away the ladder when he reaches his goal. It is difficult to accept the statement (p. 156) that 'the ancient Brahman . . . is a deity which is not in mere contrast to what-

ever else is called God, but is at the same time a mystical superlative of God.' To be in contrast to the God of theism and yet His superlative is hardly easy. We have to recognize that it is really Brahman that matters for Śāṅkara and for every Advaitist; but for Eckhart it is 'the living God' that matters, 'the eternal and ceaselessly creating God.' This work of creation is, as Dr. Otto says, 'no mere *līlā*, no playing of the Godhead, as in India' (p. 175). Eckhart derives his thought of the Divine, as every Christian should, 'from two utterly concrete realities, apprehended in the most realistic ways—the real God of the Jewish prophets, now most completely revealed in His most rich reality by Jesus of Nazareth, and this same real Jesus, so richly real in His life and death, His teaching and His persistent power.'² 'God is, in Himself,' for Eckhart, Dr. Otto tells us, 'tremendous life movement.' That He is so is proved in the Incarnation. Eckhart, being sure of that, is secured from the temptation, 'the inveterate tendency of our thought,' as Professor Pringle Pattison calls it, 'to project a more abstract God behind the living God.'³ Eckhart went far towards yielding to this temptation, but his Christian faith and Christian experience saved him from going all the way.

And for that same reason what Blake calls 'this vegetable world' retains for him in the end its reality. But what are we to say in regard to Dr. Otto's affirmation that 'in the mysticism of Eckhart and Śāṅkara the soul seeks to pass out of the region of the created to the being and dignity of God Himself' (p. 99)? Surely the Christian gospel cannot be equated with such an ambition as that implies. But here again the wisdom that Christ has taught him comes to the aid of this 'Gothic man' in his 'flight of most daring ecstasy.' 'The soul wishes that she might be God Himself, and there might be neither herself nor any creature. But it occurs to her that then God would not love! Were the creature to disappear love would be torn from His heart' (p. 179). That thought restores sanity. We can see a similar realization dawning on the minds of Indian *bhaktas* when, from such fellowship with God as they experience, they look up to the high place of Brahman. They are torn between two desires, but because God's love has not for them the reality that it has for a Christian, they accept as the higher way the way of lovelessness. And so here again Eckhart is able, just

² Von Hügel, *op. cit.*, p. 152.

³ Quoted on p. 152 of the book of Baron von Hügel just cited.

¹ F. von Hügel, *Essays and Addresses*, ii. 153.

because he is invincibly a Christian, to be a mystic and yet be humble, to be a quietist and yet to love. 'His quietism is active creativity' (p. 176). His is 'a mysticism coloured by the Christian teaching of justification and permeated through and through by the influences of its origin' (p. 199).

Thus we see that Śāṅkara's system is one of acosmic pantheism, and that Eckhart's is only saved from travelling to the same goal by the fact that it has at its centre One who is the God and Father of the Lord Jesus Christ. Dr. Oman quotes an Indian Professor as saying to him, 'The Western world plays with pantheism, and perhaps then pantheism may not do much harm, but the Eastern takes it seriously, and it sucks the blood.' 'Yet the shadow of Hegel,' Dr. Oman comments, 'even in the West, is Schopenhauer.' And Schopenhauer, we remember, said that the study of the Upanishads had been the solace of his life and would be the solace of his death.

Eckhart escapes, but barely escapes, from that fowler's snare. A God who, in the words of Heine, 'has no arms and so can give no help'; a world of unreality in which God is not; a future upon which no light shines; from these bleak consequences that follow from dalliance with pantheism Eckhart in the end escapes, and he does so by reason of the richness and reality of his assurance of the God who is revealed in Christ. He succeeds in breaking through the mist of delusion which is obscuring his sight because he cannot give up his faith in the Divine Being as essential righteousness, having within itself 'the God of the Prophets and of the Gospels—He who says of Himself "I am that I am"' (p. 207). The narrowness of his escape brings vividly before us the danger of any view that separates God from reality and makes the world a dream. To attain the eternal it is not necessary to deny the temporal. Nor can the temporal life have value and fullness of being if it is separated from the Divine. 'History,' as von Hügel reminds us, 'is essentially necessary to religion, if only as a corrective, probably the sole efficient corrective against the delusions of a false mysticism.' Dr. Otto describes in a fine passage the condition of the soul as Eckhart describes it, when the snare is broken and the soul, escaping, is united with God. 'It achieves,' he says, 'the real inward work. Where this work is performed in the ground and stillness of the soul, above space

and time, it breaks forth in temporal works, without ceasing, "without wherefore," without compulsion, without seeking for reward, without secondary purpose, in the free outpouring of a new and truly liberated will; and it is as incapable of resting as the creating God' (p. 175). How far apart is this from the deserts of abstraction to which so often the mystic road, especially in India, seems to lead.

The Indian Christian theologians who are tempted to seek a synthesis of Christianity and Vedānta will find in this book of Dr. Otto's much that should enable them to realize the perils that beset that enterprise. The very attraction that the Fourth Gospel so often has for the Indian mind may give them a hint of the danger that they have to be on their guard against. For it is undoubtedly true that this attraction in the case of some springs from a feeling that that Gospel is less rooted in history than the others, that it presents Christianity as a body of ideas for which temporal happenings are superfluous. But Christianity is, and must remain, the religion of the incarnation, rooted thus in time and history.

Again, this study of Eastern and Western mysticism reminds us of the consequences, not only from a pantheism that negates the world, but equally from a secularism or humanism, that, affirming the world, negates God. The fruit that Brahman in an environment of illusion brings forth is not dissimilar from that which is borne in our own day by a world with no environing God. What the goal and end of life is in the former case is described by Dr. Otto. It is 'the stilling of all *karmanī*, all works, all activity of will; it is quietism, *tyāga*, a surrender of the will and of doing, an abandonment of good, as of evil, works. The real Being does not work' (p. 173). And does not the secularist see a not dissimilar aspect of existence closing down inevitably upon his life? 'He finds it hard to believe,' says the author of *A Preface to Morals*, describing 'the modern man,' 'that doing any one thing is better than doing any other thing, or, in fact, that it is better than doing nothing at all.' Or, to quote the conclusion of another writer, 'for Man it remains only to cherish, ere yet the blow falls, the lofty thoughts that ennoble his little day.'¹ Life in both circumstances is unreality and emptiness, if there be no God, such as Christ reveals, permeating it and enriching it.

¹ Bertrand Russell, *A Free Man's Worship*.

Literature.

THE PREPARATION FOR CHRIST.

ANY one who has knowledge enough to read between the lines will recognize how much profound and independent thinking lies behind Professor A. C. Welch's little volume on *The Preparation for Christ in the Old Testament* (Church of Scotland Offices, Edinburgh and Glasgow; rs. 3d. net). It is the first of a series of Bible Class Text-books projected by the Church of Scotland, and if they are all on this high level of scholarship, at once thorough and popular, we predict for the series a success far beyond the confines of the Church of Scotland.

Professor Welch's treatment is as unlike the conventional treatment of the subject allotted to him as possible. The day is not long past when such a book would have been little more than an exposition of a string of so-called Messianic texts, many of them irrelevant and having no relation to chronological development. Dr. Welch, on the other hand, regards the whole religious movement which finds its literary expression in the Old Testament as the real preparation for Christ, with the result that there are not more than one or two references to texts popularly regarded as Messianic; but by way of compensation, the whole history of the Hebrew people, more particularly on its religious side, is skilfully presented in twenty-two chapters, each of which has its own point, as the march of a great purpose which finds its consummation in Christ.

With such a mass of material to manipulate in a space of less than two hundred pages, selection was inevitable, and the selection has been very happily made; we are not overburdened with detail or with the discussion of the obscurer issues, and Dr. Welch has modestly refrained from expatiating on periods and problems which he has made peculiarly his own. But all the salient things are here, all the things that matter for religion. He has shown with singular force how vital for the future was the conflict between those who believed that Kingdom and State, temple and sacrifices, were indispensable to true religion, and those who did not so believe, and it is a suggestive remark that the men who returned from exile were of the same type as those who had bitterly opposed Jeremiah. Many illuminating words are dropped by the way: here is one that goes to the heart of the matter, 'Where Amos spoke about three transgressions of Israel or four, Hosea thinks continually of one, the fruitful mother

of many. Israel had been disloyal to the love with which its God had treated it.' One of the striking features of the book is the sober criticism that is brought to bear upon historical figures which, in the wake of tradition, it has been the custom to condemn. Dr. Welch sees clearly how difficult the times were and how sincerely men whose spiritual equipment was not of the highest order could adopt the course they took; it is consequently refreshing to find here a good word spoken for men like Saul, Ahab, Ahaz, Manasseh, and Hananiah. It is also noteworthy that Professor Welch has been led, with some recent scholars, to relegate certain chapters in Ezekiel to the reign of Manasseh.

Independent judgments are to be found all over the book—from the early chapter which tells us that the victory of Joshua at Jericho was the *final* success which put a seal on the rest, to the later chapters which maintain that neither Jehoia-kim nor Zedekiah went back on the reform of Josiah. On the vexed question of the relation of the prophets to the cult, Dr. Welch is no doubt right when he says that 'they would not have left their people with no forms of worship at all.' Altogether, this unconventional treatment of a great theme is a fine exhibition of excellent scholarship presented in lucid and popular form.

More than a word is also due to a smaller volume that accompanies Dr. Welch's book. It is entitled *A Teacher's Handbook to the Preparation for Christ in the Old Testament* (Church of Scotland Offices; 6d.), and it has been prepared by the Rev. W. M. Wightman, B.D., Director of Religious Education to the Church of Scotland Youth Committee. Handbooks of this kind easily tend to become platitudinous and to contain little more than glimpses into the obvious. Nobody will hurl this charge against Mr. Wightman's book. We have examined it with an interest second only to that with which we have read Dr. Welch's own book. It is in reality what it claims to be, 'A Teacher's Handbook,' which goes over Dr. Welch's book, chapter by chapter, eliciting with the skill of a true teacher all the vital points, happily supplementing them at many points, and breaking up and summarizing the material in a way which cannot fail to be an immense boon to earnest teachers who desire to secure the maximum of edification from Dr. Welch's book. To say that it is worthy to stand beside that book is to say no more than is due.

PROBLEMS OF PEACE.

The supreme need of to-day is cosmopolitan thinking, which is characterized by one of the contributors to *Problems of Peace* (Allen & Unwin; 8s. 6d. net) as 'the very basis of security for civilised existence'; and more than most is this book fitted to clear the air and to bring home to its readers the necessity of resolutely planning for international organization to succeed the last three centuries of international anarchy. It is patent to every thinker and must be made patent to every one, be he thinker or not, that there is being enacted to-day 'a transformation in the political order of the world as profound and as vast as that which took place with the passing of the Middle Ages.' The dominant feature of this change is the attitude to State sovereignty. Historically that doctrine, in its earliest phase, played an important part as a force working for human emancipation; but in a world unified by science, trade and commerce, it is obviously no longer adequate, and there can be no future for the world unless nations recognize their obligations as frankly and determinedly as they have hitherto been accustomed to assert their rights—until, that is, they learn not just to do as they like, but to refuse to do what their nationalistic impulses would impel them to do; and until they recognize that, in the last analysis, international interests are not only not antithetic to, but essentially coincident with, national interests properly understood.

These and many other grave questions associated with the changing world of to-day are discussed in the above book with great competence and impartiality. The successive chapters represent lectures delivered last August in Geneva at the meeting of the Geneva Institute of International Relations. The lecturers are drawn from many lands, and represent many interests, academic, journalistic, political, economic, legal, etc., so that the book is a fine blend of rich experience alike on the fields of thought and action. These are the subjects discussed: The League as a Confederation, Public Opinion and The World Community, World Unemployment and its Reduction through International Co-operation, The First General Disarmament Conference, The Codification of International Law, Europe and The World Community, International Financial Relations, Labour and The World Community, The Theory of an International Society, Russia and The World Community, The British Empire and The World Community. The fact that among the contributors are Professors

Laski and Zimmern, George A. Johnston of the International Labour Office, and Sherwood Eddy is a guarantee of the thoroughness with which the problems are discussed.

Also, while there is a remarkable unanimity in the contentions of the various contributors, there is no attempt to conceal occasional differences. On p. 23, for example, P. S. Mower, of Chicago, remarks that 'for the first time in all recorded history there is really to-day a world community.' On p. 114, however, Professor Zimmern assures us that 'there is no "world community" in existence to-day. To speak as though there was is to degrade the meaning of the word "community."' Later, on p. 236, Professor J. W. Garner takes issue with this statement, pointing for evidence to the existence and achievements of the League of Nations itself.

The book is so uniformly provocative, in the good sense of that word, that it seems invidious to select any special lecture for comment. Mr. Johnston's discussion of the attitude of the various Labour organizations to the class struggle is highly informing and on the whole reassuring. Probably to non-specialists Mr. Eddy's analysis of the contrast between the ideals of Soviet Russia and of the League of Nations will appeal most. The discussion is conducted in a thoroughly impartial spirit, the merits as well as the demerits of Bolshevism being frankly recognized. 'We have in the world to-day two antithetic and challenging social orders as thesis and antithesis, neither of them perfect or final, which may both make their contribution to a higher stage of a final synthesis.' It is worth emphasizing that while in the United States at least seventy-two per cent. of the national budget is devoted to military or war purposes, in Russia only ten per cent. is devoted to administration and defence combined; and it is good to find the writer on America expressing his confidence 'that, if the League of Nations survives another ten years and continues to perform the useful work which it has been doing during the past ten years, the United States will be a member.'

In the lecture on Disarmament, by a Belgian, we are reminded that it was no less a person than Clemenceau himself who said that the limitation of armaments imposed upon Germany by the Allied and Associated Powers was 'only the first step towards that general reduction and limitation of armaments which they seek to bring about as one of the most fruitful preventives of war.' And we are further reminded that it was the unanimous conclusion of the Conference of the International

Federation of League of Nations Societies at Budapest that it was the duty of the League of Nations to arrive at equal treatment for all its Members with regard to the limitation of arms. The temper which can suggest such a proposal, which is not generosity but simple justice, will be intelligently stimulated by the perusal of this extremely able book.

HERMITS AND ANCHORITES.

Mr. Peter F. Anson, who has already secured for himself a wide public by his writings, enters into a new field in his recent volume, *The Quest of Solitude* (Dent; 7s. 6d. net). The volume is an attempt, and a very successful one, to cover the history of the solitary life in the Christian Church. The 'solitary' who wrote the engaging Introduction reminds us that the people who go in quest of solitude are usually running *away* from something, whereas the people described in this book were all running *after* something—the negative and positive quests of solitude.

The year A.D. 305 is an eventful date in the history of the solitary life in Christendom, for then it was that the door of Anthony's hermitage was forced open by a band of would-be followers. It marks the beginning of Christian monasticism. Even before the death of Anthony the eremitical life he had adopted had been imitated by hundreds of others. All along the banks of the Nile, and in the heart of the desert, were to be found many groups of scattered huts in which the hermits lived. To Pachomius we owe the introduction of cenobitic monasticism. On the banks of the Nile he founded a monastery, probably about the middle of the fourth century, in which the monks were bound to a common rule of life, and obeyed a recognized superior. They devoted themselves to manual work and to the study of Holy Scripture, and their fasts and abstinences were not so rigorous as those of the hermits.

But the solitary life soon spread to other countries besides Egypt. It was introduced not only into eastern countries but into many parts of western Europe, and, until after the death of Benedict in A.D. 540, was the normal form of monasticism in Italy, Ireland, Gaul, and Brittany. To Mr. Anson we are much indebted for very interesting and informative accounts of the Benedictine solitaires, the Carthusians, the Camaldolesi, the Carmelites, and the Franciscan and Dominican and other congregations of solitaires. Of the Camaldolesi it is said that they are *par excellence* the Hermits of the West.

Mr. Anson devotes his penultimate chapter to the question of the eremitical life in England during the Middle Ages, distinguishing among the individual solitaires between the anchorites, who were strictly recluses and could not support themselves, and the hermits. The concluding chapter treats of modern solitaires, of whom perhaps the best known is Charles de Foucauld. The whole volume gives us a vivid glimpse of the long procession of solitaires, hermits, and anchorites of all ages and all nations who have heard an Inner Voice bidding them rise up and go on the quest of solitude.

Special features of the volume are the useful bibliographies and the numerous drawings from Mr. Anson's own hand.

HARTMANN'S ETHICS.

We scarcely anticipated that Hartmann's great work on Ethics would be available so soon in its complete English translation, but here are the second and third volumes before us—*Ethics*, by Professor Nicolai Hartmann, volumes ii. and iii. (Allen & Unwin; 16s. and 12s. 6d. net each). As the difference in price indicates, the third volume does not quite extend to the dimensions of the second.

Volume ii. is entitled *Moral Values*, and, we learn, was actually the first portion of the work to be excogitated. The author's experiences as a soldier on the Russian Front doubtless set his mind busy on the problem of moral values; and as doubtless suggested something towards what is here made so clear that moral values are not simple but exceedingly complex. The moral situation with which one finds himself at any time confronted is seldom simple; the considerations which decide his response are usually complex; and the outcome is a synthesis of various and frequently contradictory virtues. Such in very brief form describes the main thesis of this volume. The part, we think, that will prove most interesting and illuminative to the reader is the really brilliant analysis of the individual virtues.

The third and concluding volume deals with *Moral Freedom*. The problem of Freedom is of fundamental importance and unending interest. We have often been counselled to lay it aside; but the human mind finds itself unable to follow that advice, just because it remains convinced that the question of Freedom is fundamental. We are not sure that Hartmann has completely satisfied us; questions arise in our mind after a perusal of his argument, and we should like longer time to

reflect on his views before we commit ourselves. What we may say meantime is that he has given, if not a final solution of the problem, at least the best treatment of it that we have read. He defends what common sense suggests—that if we are not free to act otherwise than we do, then feelings of responsibility and remorse are meaningless. He shows how very confused notions of freedom are, and indicates how we may escape from the fallacious reasoning to which such confusion ministers. Were it for nothing more than this volume alone, we should say that Hartmann's *Ethics* is one of the most important works that have appeared in recent years.

SCOTT.

Is Scott read to-day? If not, it will not be the fault of Mr. John A. Patten, M.C., M.A., who has written a thoroughly interesting centenary volume entitled *Sir Walter Scott: A Character Study* (James Clarke; 5s. net), which dwells with affectionate admiration on the man rather than on the novelist and poet, and with fine persuasiveness seeks to commend both the man and his works to the present generation. He draws skilfully from the *Journal*, which covers the last six years of Scott's life, to illustrate the character of the man with its blend of tenderness and indomitable courage. Mr. Patten not only knows his Scott and his Lockhart, but also the critical literature that has gathered round the name and works of Scott during the last century, and it is a great convenience to find assembled here together the estimates of such men as Hazlitt, Carlyle, Ruskin, Bagehot, R. H. Hutton, and Professor Saintsbury. Those estimates differ in detail, but most of them agree in their recognition of Scott as a noble man and a very gifted writer; it is curious, as Mr. Patten remarks, to find sprung upon us from diverse quarters the comparison of him with Shakespeare—the bare possibility of such a comparison is enough to suggest the literary greatness of Scott. 'He added to the gathering of imaginary persons,' says Professor Saintsbury, 'more and greater figures than had been added by anyone except Shakespeare.'

Mr. Patten's book is not an indiscriminating eulogy. Though a passionate admirer of his hero, he is not blind to his faults, and especially to the dangerous ambition which led him to spend money on the building of Abbotsford which the means at his disposal did not justify; but, while not denying his deep-seated Toryism and his passionate opposition to the Reform Bill, he shows, both from the

novels and from Scott's dealings with men, that at bottom he was democratically minded. And, in particular, he acquits Scott of the charge so often brought against him that his religion was conventional. Formally, there was doubtless some truth in that; but that Scott had the root of the matter in him is abundantly proved from his *Journal* and from his attitude to disaster. Mr. Patten brings to his task two qualities essential to all sound criticism, namely, knowledge and appreciation; he believes, indeed, that 'Scott was one of the greatest men who ever lived.' This hero-worship, while it has not impeded the exercise of his critical judgment, has enabled him to write with an enthusiasm which is justified alike by the facts of Scott's character, of his immense popularity with his contemporaries, of his influence on the literature of Europe, and of the power he has exercised from that day almost to this. This book is a capital introduction to the study of Scott, and it should send readers who do not know him back to the novels and the *Journal* with whetted appetite.

CHURCH PRAISE.

A book of quite extraordinary excellence on the praise service of the sanctuary has been issued by the Church of Scotland—*Manual of Church Praise* (Church of Scotland Offices; 4s.). The sub-title is 'According to the Use of the Church of Scotland,' but this is misleading, for the book will prove of immense service to the authorities of any Church. The subjects dealt with are such as these: The Function and Use of Music in Church Worship, The Ordering of Public Worship, Hymns and Hymn Tunes, The Canticles, The Choir and Choir Training, Congregational Singing, The Use of the Organ in the Church Service, Praise in the Sunday School, Suggested Praise for the Christian Year, and The Relations of Minister, Congregation, Choir and Organist in the Service of Praise. The greatest authorities on such subjects in Scotland are among the writers—Mr. Herbert Wiseman, Mr. Willan Swainson, Dr. Allt of St. Giles' Cathedral, the Rev. G. Wauchope Stewart, the Rev. Millar Patrick, and Mr. A. M. Henderson of Glasgow University.

What impresses us about all these writers is the way in which they have kept their eye on the object. Their essays are full of practical counsel that could come only from experience and competent insight. Particular mention should be made of the essay on 'The Choir and Choir Training,' by Mr. T. C. L. Pritchard, which is so good that it ought

to be printed separately as a pamphlet and circulated at a modest price among all the choirs of all the churches. Certainly it should be available in a separate form. It would help choir-efficiency in a number of desirable ways. Mr. Swainson's chapter on the use of the organ in public worship is almost as good in its own way.

It is inevitable that in the contributions of enthusiasts, who are also specialists, there should be pronouncements that the ordinary person will not approve. Dr. Millar Patrick's condemnation of the 'Vesper,' sung after service, for example, will seem to many devout people a needless piece of pedantry. One of his reasons is that 'practically every vesper one hears is trivial in substance.' That is totally at variance with the experience of many others. What finer dismissal from a service could one wish than the ancient 'God be in my head.' There are a few other expressions of opinion that are of doubtful validity. But this was inevitable. Of the book generally we should like to express emphatic approval. It will be a singular boon to the public worship of Scotland if it is digested and followed, and in many of its parts may be helpful beyond that country's borders.

The Varieties of Present-Day Preaching (Abingdon Press; \$2.00) consists of a series of lectures delivered before the Boston University School of Theology. This is the fourth publication of the kind which has been issued under the auspices of this School and under the editorship of President G. Bromley Oxnam of De Pauw University. The lecturers at the fourth Conference on Preaching were chosen from diverse fields, and they include in Dr. Robert Elliott Speer one who is well known on this side of the Atlantic. They proved to be in personality and teaching as diverse as were their fields, but they were united in their interest in spiritual reality, in their insistence upon ethical living, and in their refusal to deal in creedal niceties. 'In this hour,' says the Editor, 'when not a few declare the pleas of the preachers to be but the babblings of Babel, is it not strikingly significant that men who were chosen to reveal varieties, should unknowingly have demonstrated their basic oneness? Jew and Gentile, Unitarian and Methodist, Congregationalist and Presbyterian speak a common tongue.'

In one of the most striking of the lectures a suggestion is made with which many will sympathize. It is that when the true preacher is discovered he should be set apart, that he may be a prophet

indeed. He should be protected as one protects some delicate instrument or tempered weapon. Such a sword of the Spirit should not be permitted to hack itself into dullness or a broken edge. All routine tasks and administrative jobs should be lifted from the shoulder of the true preacher, and he should be encouraged to conserve his strength, preserve his time, and protect his inner life. After all, the true preacher is not common among us, and it is a thousand pities to see his genius being wasted in the routine of a great city charge.

Canon Donaldson of Westminster Abbey once summarized the seven deadly sins of modern society as Policies without Principles, Wealth without Work, Pleasure without Conscience, Knowledge without Character, Industry without Morality, Science without Humanity, Worship without Sacrifice. The Rev. M. S. Rice, D.D., of Detroit, has made these the titles of chapters in a book which he calls *Diagnosing To-day: Seven Deadly Sins of Modern Life, Studies in Present-Day Problems* (Abingdon Press; \$1.50). Dr. Rice analyses modern conditions in an effort to find underlying causes, and his remedy for modern ills is the gospel of the Living Christ. These are good, sound discourses, which, we imagine, represent the best kind of American preaching. One is indeed inclined occasionally to query statements of such critics as Dr. Rice, who are led by a sense of the severity of present-day troubles to overestimate their seriousness. We doubt very much indeed, for example, whether it is harder to believe in God to-day than ever before. It was much harder forty years ago at a time when Huxley and Tyndall were in the ascendant. Our troubles are big enough, however, to need all the good advice we can get from America or anywhere else.

Life in Nature, by Mr. James Hinton (Allen & Unwin; 10s. 6d. net), has been republished, with an introduction by Havelock Ellis. The work was first published in 1862, and it may seem a bold undertaking to re-issue a scientific treatise of seventy years ago. Yet the editor is right in thinking that Hinton is still worth reading. He tells in the preface how, while still in his teens and in the cold grip of a mechanistic theory of the universe, he chanced upon James Hinton and found emancipation in his *Life in Nature*. Hinton was undoubtedly a pioneer in the world of thought. The key to his conception of the universe is 'the fundamental unity of the world, not in the sense of debasing the organic to the level of the inorganic,

but rather of raising the inorganic to the level of the organic.' 'Either the material world is dead and life does not spring from it; or, *if life springs from it, then it is not dead.*' In these days, when the dividing line between matter and energy has grown indistinct, and when an organic conception of the universe is dominant, Hinton deserves to be read again, and he will be found wonderfully suggestive. His literary style is above praise, and with his reasoning there goes a fine blend of imagination and feeling which makes his book a delight to read.

The theology of Karl Barth is so positive and so resolutely expressed that it is apt to rouse men either to enthusiastic acceptance or to decisive rejection. We have had a number of books of exposition and appreciation of the Barthian theology. Now we have one that is frankly critical, *The Challenge of Karl Barth*, by Mr. Carl Heath (Allenson; 1s. net). Mr. Heath writes from the Quaker standpoint, and while he welcomes the rousing prophetic note in Barth's message he finds that Barth fails to do justice to the doctrine of the inner light which is the evidence of the Divine in man. This 'critical comment' is of value in that it sets before the reader with great clearness the essential point at issue between the Barthian School and the modern religious teaching which they so strongly challenge.

The Rev. Thomas Allison, M.A., who some three years ago gave us a short but penetrating study of 'English Religious Life in the Eighth Century as illustrated by Contemporary Letters,' has put us further in his debt by publishing *Pioneers of English Learning* (Blackwell; 5s. net). This, too, is a small work of one hundred and seven pages; but it is marked by sound scholarship and represents a great amount of patient research. It reveals that the days of the Heptarchy were by no means barren of scholars, and will serve to preserve not a few worthy names from the dust of oblivion. Like its predecessor, this new study by Mr. Allison is a supplement to the 'Ecclesiastical History' of Bede. Valuable to the student of early English Church history, we commend it as interesting to a far wider circle.

Professor S. A. Cook, in his inaugural lecture on *The Place of the Old Testament in Modern Research* (Cambridge University Press; 2s. net), who has been truly described by Dr. Alexander Nairne as 'that finely philosophic scholar,' has convincingly

exhibited the extremely complex nature of the Old Testament problem and the imperative necessity of organizing the vast and ever-accumulating material which is contributing by degrees to the solution of it. That material has been created by rapid advances in linguistic study, by the internal study of the Old Testament and the literary origin and historical value of its documents, by the accumulation of external material in the form of monuments, papyri, results of excavation, etc., and by the comparative study of beliefs and customs. All this to Dr. Cook is not a mere academic exercise; it helps us to a deeper knowledge of ourselves, and enables us to make intelligent preparation for the future. The Old Testament, which has behind it a drama, 'has a purifying effect upon us who live in an age of dramatic history.' From this thoughtful lecture we rise with a deeper sense than ever of the uniqueness of the Old Testament, of its place in human history, thought, and religion, and of the fascination of its problems, notably of 'the great creative period in Israel.'

Dr. Alexander Nairne has written a paper, which 'is meant to be practical,' on *The Old Testament in the Church* (Cambridge University Press; 1s. net), and addressed it to 'active servants of the Church.' In broad outlines and in quite untechnical language he shows how the Old Testament should be approached and taught, for it is his belief that instruction is one of the duties of the Church to the people. A very rapid sketch of the history is accompanied by a plan for a course extending over three years. But the gospel is the centre, and it should come first: 'first the life and teaching of our Lord, then the Old Testament as introductory, and the rest of the New Testament as interpretation and application.' Dr. Nairne not only understands the Old Testament, he loves it. 'Grandeur is its prerogative,' and 'next to the Gospels Genesis is the most beautiful literature in the world.'

Silver and Gold, by the Rev. E. F. E. Wigram, M.A. (Church Missionary Society; 1s. net), is 'the C.M.S. story of the year 1931.' Having read several of the previous volumes we can confidently say that none is better than the present one, richer in interest and inspiration. It is a heroic story of Christian faith triumphing over world-wide depression, and of Christian love overcoming prejudice and adverse economic conditions. It is a record which will hearten all lovers of the Kingdom and confirm them in the assurance that in the gospel is the hope of the world.

It is generally assumed that the origin of the Synagogue is to be found among the Jewish exiles in Babylon. Solomon Zeitlin disputes this. In *The Origin of the Synagogue* (Dropsie College, Philadelphia) he argues that its origin was not religious but secular, and that it first emerged in the period after the Return. The phrase *בית הכנסת*, which is never used in the Old Testament, denotes strictly a house of assembly, not a house of worship. The meetings were convened primarily for the consideration of problems of a social and economic order; doubtless they were accompanied by prayer, and later the public reading of the Torah was instituted, and later still they became permanent institutions for the reading of the Torah and for worship, though even then something of their original secular character was retained, at least to the extent that meetings of the various charitable organizations were held in the synagogues, and we hear of Jewish guilds meeting in 'the synagogue of Alexandria.' Besides these local assemblies, there were assemblies of national character, called The Great Synagogue, convened to consider problems affecting the whole of Jewry. It is of interest to note that *συναγωγή* is not used in the LXX for a house of worship. The whole discussion illustrates the thesis that institutions of a purely religious character may have their origin in social and economic causes.

The Lindsey Press is issuing a series of booklets (at one shilling net) on the general subject, 'Religion: Its Modern Needs and Problems.' Already nine have appeared on such topics as 'Religious Experience,' 'Psychical Research,' 'The Bible To-day,' 'Modern Religious Fundamentals,' 'Miracles and Modern Knowledge.' The most recent issue is *Steps to the Religious Life*, by Mr. William Whitaker, M.A., Lecturer in Christian Doctrine at the Unitarian College, Manchester. The small book is an earnest and intelligent account of the soul's experience in reaching God. The way lies largely through practical goodness, though the contribution of mystical experience is fairly admitted. The argument is on a high level both of seriousness and intelligence throughout, and the eight chapters in which the writer expounds his religious philosophy are a good specimen of the best Unitarian religious thought.

Mr. H. V. Morton has won a place for his unconventional but singularly interesting guide-books for England, Scotland, and Ireland. His latest addition to the series—*In Search of Wales* (Methuen;

7s. 6d. net)—has all the features that have made the volume on Scotland, for example, so popular. He has nothing to say about railway time-tables or fares or the best hotels or out-of-pocket expenses of any kind. But any one who is content to sit by the fire in his arm-chair may accompany Mr. Morton throughout his tour of the Principality and feel that the experience is far more than worth the money. What concerns us here, however, is not Mr. Morton's descriptions of his tour, but his impression of the mining population in South Wales in their attitude to the hard times through which they have been living. He had the privilege of descending an important colliery, and describes his experiences in vivid narrative. 'When I thought of seven and a half hours in this place every day,' he writes, 'I knew why the shift going off duty in a mine never jokes with the shift going down!' It was no more singular to find a Welsh miner who was fond of music and knew about Handel than to find one who was fond of dogs. This is his testimony about the miner's wife. She 'is one of the heroines of Great Britain. For at least ten years she has been pinching and scraping. Yet you never hear her complain.' Her ambition once was to save enough to buy a piano or a Welsh harp. 'I was passing a village hall in a mining valley on a Sunday. I heard a male voice choir trying to lift the roof from the place. The sound was so good that I opened the door and went in. . . . About thirty young men in blue serge suits were grouped round an ancient but heroic piano. . . . And the choir sang like angels in blue serge.' Mr. Morton, though he went through the Pass of Llanberis on foot and ascended Snowden in like manner and saw the far extended view from its summit, and though he visited Criccieth and saw Mr. Lloyd George, found nothing more characteristic of Wales than the Eisteddfod and its varied ceremonies and musical performances. The Welsh people, like the Highlanders in Scotland, have the qualities of the scenery of Wales.

The amount of exposition and criticism of Whitehead's system of philosophy bears witness to the fact that it has both impressed and baffled contemporary thinkers. *Whitehead's Philosophy of Organism*, by Dorothy M. Emmet (Macmillan; 8s. 6d. net), is the work of one who is at once an acknowledged disciple of Whitehead and a widely read and highly competent critic. When Hutchison Stirling set out to reveal the 'Secret of Hegel' he ended by keeping it, and some may feel that Miss Emmet is no more successful in her attempt to reveal the secret of Whitehead. At any rate it

should be understood, as indeed the writer insists repeatedly, that here is no simple and easy compendium of the Philosophy of Organism. It is no substitute for the study of Whitehead's own works. To the reader who has no previous acquaintance with these it would be almost wholly unintelligible. It is a book for the serious student of philosophy, and is written with supreme ability and fullness of thought. Whitehead's place in the history of philosophy, and especially his affinities with Plato, the difficulties of his strange terminology, the strength and subtlety of his reasoning, and the ruling principles of his system are discussed with great acumen and wealth of learning. This is a book that cannot be ignored by any who would grapple with the greatest philosophic thinker of our time.

A Wordbook of Metaphysics, by Mr. F. W. Felkin, M.A. (Milford; 3s. 6d. net), 'seeks only to present a series of simple facts which nearly fifty years of comparison with the details of human experience have shown no reason to question.' In these words the author states the aim of the treatise, but what the statement means it is hard to understand in the light of the contents of the treatise. What the treatise actually contains is a number of loosely concatenated reflections on life and experience, supported by quotations. The reflections are usually of value, and the quotations usually relevant. They are both of them gathered under common terms such as dualism, egoism, immanence, personality, or uncommon terms like differentiation, homogeneous, object of life. The volume contains a number of misprints as well as incoherences and irrelevances.

Studies in the Testimony Book, by D. Plooi (Noord-Hollandsche Uitgeversmaatschappij, Amsterdam), treats the theory advanced by Dr. J. Rendel Harris, that the New Testament writers used a systematically arranged collection of Testimonies from the Old Testament, directed *adversus Judaeos* and intended to serve as a basis for Christian teaching. In two detailed essays Dr. Plooi devotes special attention to the Corinthian Epistles and the Epistle to the Hebrews, and argues that the Testimony Book was read in its original Palestinian dress by Paul, and that the whole thought and style of the Epistle to the Hebrews are built on a Greek translation of the Testimony Book. He urges that the consequences of this theory are very important. 'The early Christian dogma, especially its conceptions regarding Christ, the New Temple, the

New Circumcision, and so on, are not based upon Hellenistic speculations, but find their origin in the primitive Christian Church, where the Bible was read with its Targumic rendering and interpretation. The Logos, for instance, of the early Christian Church is not to be derived primarily from Stoic teaching, but from the Targumic tradition, and so on' (p. 26 f.). These learned *Studies* are worthy of the most careful consideration.

The price of the essays is not stated, but as they are printed with paper covers in forty-eight pages, it is not likely to be considerable.

Every reader of the Old Testament is vaguely aware that light is thrown upon it from sources beyond itself; but what those sources are and what they say, is to most people a sealed book. To the rescue of this ignorance comes a volume on *Pages from the Past: Book I, The Near East (2000-500 B.C.)*, compiled by M. Irene Luke and E. F. Priest Shaw, and published by Messrs. Pitman at the low price of 2s. 6d. net. The material, arranged in successive periods, is drawn from contemporary sources—Egyptian, Assyrian, Persian, Greek: naturally the Bible itself is frequently laid under contribution. Here in original documents or inscriptions one is brought into touch with Hammurabi, Sennacherib, Cyrus, etc. The excerpts begin with the Babylonian account of Creation, and end in the Persian period with quotations from the Zend Avesta and Herodotus, of whose history considerable use is made. Here are to be found excerpts from the Egyptian Book of the Dead and from Akenaton's famous hymn to Aton with its curious resemblance to Ps 104. The book will be a welcome addition to students of Biblical literature and history in the light of its historical background.

In *Moral Freedom and the Christian Faith* (S.P.C.K.; 5s. net) Dr. Cyril H. Valentine, M.A., deals with the present-day revolt against traditional morality, shows in what degree it is justified, and seeks to lay again the foundations of a reasonable ethic. His argument is to the effect that 'morality cannot be presented as a self-consistent and self-contained system. Within the field of morals there can be neither completeness nor finality. Either morality must forfeit all claim to ultimate authority, or else it must recognize that the only authority which would be adequate must have a wider basis than morality alone can provide.' This basis he finds in religion, and especially in the supreme law of love revealed in Christ. Here we come into touch with ultimate reality, and are

made free with the liberty of the children of God. Dr. Valentine has written a wise and thoughtful book which should commend the Christian faith and morals to many who in these troubled days have been carried away from their moorings.

One of the findings of the Lambeth Conference of 1930 was that 'the life and task of the clergyman have not been presented in their true and really attractive character,' while the Committee on the Staffing of Parishes says that to many of the younger generation 'the parson's seems no job for a man.' To meet this criticism a book has been issued under the title *A Man's Job* (S.C.M.; 2s. net), edited by Canon B. K. Cunningham. It is the joint work of eight clergymen, each of whom contributes a chapter on some aspect of church work in which he has had special experience. Perhaps the best is on 'The Priest in the City Parish,' by Canon Green, but the quality is uniformly high and the whole book most readable and instructive.

New Life through God, by Toyohiko Kagawa (S.C.M.; 5s. net), is 'made up of lectures, given during one of my evangelistic tours through Manchuria and Northern Kyushu.' They are by no means the usual type of evangelistic addresses, but deal with all manner of social, industrial, political, and international questions, though all are dealt with from the Christian point of view. The translator explains that 'they were recorded at different times by two different secretaries. The secretaries were not able to catch everything that Mr. Kagawa

said, so in places there may seem to be a lack of continuity in his thought.' This, doubtless, accounts for much, but the whole book is somewhat of a medley, and the reader feels that these addresses could never be delivered with any success to a Western audience. The most notable feature is the blend of ardent patriotism and Christian fervour which runs through them. Mr. Kagawa is above all things the apostle of divine love. 'Love is my all in all. . . . Love is the supreme sovereign. Love alone can subdue the world. . . Love binds society together from within. It is both linchpin and girdle; and love can never be annihilated.'

Liberating the Lay Forces of Christianity, by Dr. John R. Mott (S.C.M.; 4s. net), contains five lectures delivered last year at the Colgate-Rochester Divinity School. Few men can have so wide and varied an experience as Dr. Mott has of the service of the Christian Church in all lands, and no one is better fitted to gauge the forces at work. Dr. Mott's thesis, which he establishes with ample historical evidence, is that the services of laymen in the past cannot be overestimated, and that the great need of to-day is to enlist their energies more fully in the work of the Church. He is strong on the side of organization, and almost everything he says is most wise and wholesome. But when one notes the emphasis laid on finance and the importance of securing the countenance of influential men, a doubt creeps into the mind whether this was quite the way of Jesus. The lectures, however, are packed full of good things, and are a fresh revelation of Dr. Mott's statesmanship.

'Sharing.'

A FURTHER STUDY OF THE OXFORD GROUP MOVEMENT.

BY THE REVEREND J. P. THORNTON-DUESBERY, CORPUS CHRISTI COLLEGE, OXFORD.

AMONG the words and phrases most commonly employed at gatherings of the Oxford Group Movement is the verb 'to share.' The *New English Dictionary* (in a two-column article) defines it as

'*I. trans.* . . . *d.* To divide (what one has or receives) into portions, and give shares to others as well as one's self,'

and since 'sharing' has come to be virtually a

terminus technicus in the Group, it is of importance to answer the questions, what is thus divided? to whom is the distribution made? and how is it performed? The answers to these questions will be most clearly perceived if we recognize from the outset that 'sharing' is used in the Group Movement in two senses, which, though they merge into each other at one point, are in practice readily distinguishable, and may be further defined as 'Confession' and 'Witness.'

1. Confession (if I may again quote from the *New English Dictionary*) is, in this sense,

'the disclosing of something the knowledge of which by others is considered humiliating or prejudicial to the person confessing; a making known or acknowledging of one's fault, wrong, crime, weakness, etc.'

It means, in simple language, being honest about oneself, being willing to admit that we are wrong, to concede our failures, to own up to our sins. With unbroken unanimity the Christian Church down all the ages has declared that such confession is essential, if sinful man is to come into a right relationship with God. οὐ γάρ ἐστι διαστολή πάντες γὰρ ἡμαρτον, καὶ ὑπεροῦνται τῆς δόξης τοῦ Θεοῦ.¹ There is no need here to labour the point. We are in desperate need of forgiveness; and in the last resort, if we would really be 'justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus,' then, whatever aids we may use to help us to reach it, we must come to the place where we stand before God face to face and confess to Him our sins. There is no other way to life.²

Now, ideally, such confession as this would be made direct to God, without the need of any human assistance. Christ, as St. Paul showed once for all in refuting the false teachers at Colosse, is the only Mediator required between God and man. 'By His one oblation of Himself once offered' He opened the doors for ever, and set up a ladder from earth to heaven. It remains only for man freely to enter in. Theoretically, therefore, there is not the smallest reason why a sinner should not confess his sins direct to God, and receive, and know that he is receiving, God's forgiveness then and there. Obviously, in fact, this has happened and happens over and over again. Many a quiet bedside or lonely hill has been witness of such transactions, from which a man has gone out as clean and joyous and certain of Divine vocation as Isaiah went out from the Temple 'in the year that king Uzziah died,' or the 'publican went down to his house.'

But, unfortunately, we are not ideal, and, not only in the Oxford Group Movement, but also in the whole Church, experience has shown the value of human help in reaching God. For many

'sharing,' in the sense of confessing their sins and shortcomings to another person, is a virtual necessity. Only so do they grasp the reality of their confession, of the God to whom they confess, and of the forgiveness which He bestows. The forgiveness itself does not depend upon the sharing; its appropriation by the individual constantly does.

Such confession was apparently practised by those who sought the Baptism of John;³ it was probably required also before Christian Baptism;⁴ it was made (in detail, it would seem) by many believers at Ephesus who came ἐξομολογούμενοι καὶ ἀναγγέλλοντες τὰς πράξεις αὐτῶν;⁵ something of the kind seems indicated also in St. Paul's statement in 2 Co 7¹¹;⁶ and St. James urges his readers to 'confess their sins one to another,' though it must remain doubtful whether this refers only to the sick.⁷

In at least one primitive Christian community public confession of sins was the rule,⁸ and though this was later found to be undesirable⁹ as an indiscriminate practice, the practical need of this form of human help has always been recognized in the Church. With the vexed question of auricular confession and the reception of Holy Communion we are not here concerned; the point is simply that 'Catholic' and 'Protestant' alike recognize the need, and in the Anglican Communion this is expressly stated at the close of the First Exhortation prescribed for giving notice of the celebration of the Holy Communion: 'If there be any of you, who by this means [self-examination, direct personal confession to God, and the making of restitution when necessary] cannot quiet his own conscience herein, but requireth further comfort or counsel, let him come to me, or to some other discreet and learned minister of God's Word, and open his grief; that by the ministry of God's holy Word he may receive the benefit of absolution, together with ghostly counsel and advice, to the quieting of his conscience and avoidance of all scruple and doubtfulness.'

The principle enshrined in these words is one of first-rate importance; the confession is to be entirely voluntary, and it is not necessarily to be

³ Mk 1⁵, Mt 3⁶.

⁴ Ac 2³⁸ 3¹⁹.

⁵ Ac 19¹⁸.

⁶ Cf. K. E. Kirk, *The Vision of God*, p. 172, note.

⁷ Ja 5¹⁶; cf. Kirk, *ibid.*; Preuschen-Bauer, *Wörterbuch z. N.T.*, s.v. *ἰδομαι*.

⁸ Didache 4¹⁴, 'Thou shalt confess thy transgressions in church.'

⁹ E.g. ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ is dropped in Barnabas 19¹² and Ap. Const. vii. 14, which are dependent upon the Didache.

¹ Ro 3²⁸.

² For Old Testament teaching on the point, cf. e.g. Lv 26⁴⁰, 2 S 12¹³ 24¹⁰, Neh 9⁸, Ps 51, Is 6⁵; for John the Baptist, Mk 1⁴, for the Apostolic Church, Ac 19¹⁸, Ja 5¹⁶; for our Lord Himself, Lk 15¹⁸ 18¹³; and the Lord's Prayer itself, 'Forgive us our trespasses.'

an exhaustive enumeration of sins, but 'the opening of grief'; further, the qualifications of the 'minister',¹ who receives this 'opening of grief,' are knowledge of God's Word and discretion. Naturally such sharing should be private and matter of strict confidence.

What the Oxford Group Movement has done is to show that these cases of spiritual distress are far more numerous than is normally supposed,² and, further, to point out that it is part of the vocation of all Christian men and women to seek, through the Holy Spirit, such 'discretion' and such 'knowledge of God's Word' that they may be able to give effective help in these cases of need. But ever and always the receiver of these confessions must remember the essentials of his ministry; he is there to lead the sick soul to the foot of the Cross where, *and where alone*, God's forgiveness is bestowed. He is responsible, under God, for showing the penitent what his sin has cost the Heavenly Father; for showing him, too, the everlasting patience of the Father's Love, so that he may learn where to turn at once if he should slip into sin again. He is entrusted with the message of St. John: 'These things write I unto you, that ye may not sin. And if any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: and he is the propitiation for our sins.'³ 'He that is bathed needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit.'⁴ The man who has grasped that miracle of Divine Love will in time be set free from the need of 'sharing for release'; he will go straight back to the Father's House.

Further, for the penitent himself, willingness thus to 'share' with another person is often an indication of true repentance. Many persons go on verbally confessing the same sin to God times without number, but with no lasting victory. They may never have learned the difference between mere remorse and true repentance, while the sting of reality involved in sharing with another person may be the means of bringing them to the latter. There are cases in which the refusal to share has been the last stronghold of the pride which blocks the path to God; there can be no life until that stronghold has fallen.

Lastly, under the heading of Confession, the Oxford Group Movement has rightly insisted on the moral obligation of restitution, and this frequently includes confession to other members of the

Christian community, because the sin of the individual has involved a breach of fellowship with them.

Restitution was, of course, a clearly recognized principle in Judaism,⁵ and receives its explicit Christian sanction in the story of Zacchæus.⁶ And in these modern days I know of many cases where the penitent has not merely been content to restore the book 'borrowed' from the school library, or use an anonymous money order to return the sum wrongly taken from the insurance company, but by word of mouth or over his own clear signature has boldly explained the *reason* for his restitution. At that point the sharing which began as Confession passes on into Witness to the new life in Christ.

2. When Sharing is used in this second sense of Witnessing, both the direct and the indirect objects of the verb are changed. The man in need confesses his sins to the Christian 'minister'; the man whose needs have been met in Christ bears witness to his Master and shares Him with those who know Him not. Sharing as confession takes place before the rich man's cure; sharing after it is witness to what the Great Physician has done. And, incidentally, those who thus recognize the obligation of every Christian 'by all means to save some,' find that the depth of their own experience is increased.

Christianity is Christ. But if we wish Him to be accepted, we must make it perfectly plain who He is and what He has done. The man born blind and healed by Jesus makes that the heart of his message: 'One thing I know, that, whereas I was blind, now I see.'⁷ That, too, was the witness of the Samaritan woman: 'He told me all things that ever I did.' Many believed because of her words, and many more because through her they were led to a direct experience of Christ Himself.⁸ The Gadarene demoniac was expressly told to bear such witness: 'return to thy house, and declare how great things God hath done for thee.'⁹ A classic instance of such sharing is provided in 1 Ti 1¹²⁻¹⁷, classic not only in the frankness of its confession, but in its resonant concluding ascription of all the glory to God.

The Oxford Group is thus simply restating a long-established, but sometimes forgotten, truth, when it insists that the adequate presentation of Christ's Good News frequently demands the sharing of His victories over sin in our own lives. Unless we are willing, *as guided by God*, to share explicitly and definitely just what Christ has done for us, the man we are trying to help may feel it is all too

¹ This was substituted for 'priest' in 1552.

² 'Repression,' sometimes of really serious kinds, is only too common both among clergy and laity.

³ 1 Jn 2^{1, 2}.

⁴ Jn 13¹⁰.

⁵ Nu 5⁵⁻⁷.

⁶ Lk 4³⁰⁻⁴¹.

⁷ Jn 9²⁵.

⁸ Lk 8⁸⁰.

vague to become a personal reality to himself. 'Yes,' he may feel, 'it's all very well for these naturally good people; but they've never been faced with my problem nor set to tame such passions as mine'; and so the sweetest rain may fall upon ground that is so hard and thirsty that it cannot take it in.

But if we can say definitely, 'Here' (naming the point) 'Christ has won for me forgiveness for the past and power in the present'; or if, again (without betraying any confidence), we can testify, 'I know a man who had exactly your problem, and Christ has given him victory over it'—then we are well on the way to convincing the other man that Christ can and will do for him what He has done for us and for our friends. We are giving a far more adequate picture of Christ's power by sharing the thing from which He has saved us, than we should by making no mention of our own problems and their solution. What men ask for to-day is a scientific demonstration that the gospel works, and there is no argument as convincing as a changed life.

When the rulers and scribes 'beheld the boldness of Peter and John, and had perceived that they were unlearned and ignorant men, they marvelled; and they took knowledge of them, that they had been with Jesus. And seeing the man which was healed standing with them, they could say nothing against it.'¹ Unfortunately, much of the reluctance to 'share' in this sense is simply due to the absence of personal experience of the saving power of Christ.

Again, the mutual confidence which is necessary for the full giving and taking of our message is often to be won only by sharing. The person we are trying to help often feels that his particular problem is quite different from that of any one else, and that we should be shocked if he told us about it. And yet, after all, the Church is simply a fellowship of saved sinners, and if we share our own problems first, we gain the other party's confidence and then he is more ready to learn the cure.

Frequently, for example, a father has won the confidence of his boy by telling him something of the conflicts of his own youth and of what Christ has done for him. Such sharing does not lessen the boy's respect for his father; it increases it; and he knows now that his father will understand; the two are equal before God; together they can seek and find the answer in Christ. Conversely,

failure to share creates a barrier, and a man's heart may well be sore as he realizes that so many of the problems of this generation—fixed distrust between parents and children, divorce, suicide, or insanity in many forms—could have been prevented from ever arising if there had been such confidence between the persons concerned that natural sharing could have lifted the barrier in the early stages.

Finally, sharing in the sense of Witness is governed by certain fundamental principles.

It must always be done under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and must aim at giving intelligent help. Observance of this will prevent any impropriety in sharing, any selfishness or self-display, any deadening reiterations of the story shared. Thus there will be nothing mechanical in the witness given; it will always have a constructive message.

Secondly, there must be nothing in our lives we are not *willing* to share if God commands. Under the guidance of the Spirit, we should be willing to share anything, at any time, with any one—which does not mean sharing everything, every time, with every one! The plea 'That is too sacred to share,' is sometimes just selfish or sentimental. Nothing can be too sacred for God to use.

Thirdly, the question of just *how much* to share must again depend upon guidance. Usually there will not be much detail in public sharing. In most cases it is enough to name the sin over which victory has been given in general terms, e.g. pride, fear, dishonesty, impurity, selfishness, hatred. We must not lose our way and confuse others in a multitude of words. In private interviews more detailed sharing may be right. But in public and in private alike sharing must be 'guided,' and must always be explicit witness to the Work and Power of Christ. It is most important for the 'sharer' to make this perfectly plain, as very many of those with whom he talks know little or nothing of Christ, and nothing must be taken for granted.

Fourthly, care must be taken never to betray a confidence or involve another without his consent. Obviously this does not preclude the use of other people's stories when we are quite sure that they are willing to have them told. But very often names must be suppressed and details avoided which might betray identity or rouse an idle curiosity. Whatever is said must be said with a deep respect for human personality, such as springs from the true indwelling Love of Christ.

And from first to last there must be but a single motive—God's Will be done and His Sovereignty acknowledged upon earth.

¹ Ac 4¹³⁻¹⁴.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

How did the Dodo die?

BY THE REVEREND GORDON HAMLIN, B.A., CARDIFF.

'Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might.'—Ec 9¹⁰.

I EXPECT many of you know *Alice in Wonderland*, and love it and laugh over it the same as I do. It is just one hundred years since it was written, and you will have heard of the centenary celebrations and know that the author was really Mr. C. L. Dodgson, a great mathematician, but who used another name, Lewis Carroll, when he wrote *Alice in Wonderland*.

Do you remember the Dodo, and the Caucus-race? When the race was over they all wanted to know who had won. 'This question the Dodo could not answer without a great deal of thought, and it sat for a long time with one finger pressed against its forehead while the rest waited in silence. At last the Dodo said, "Everybody has won, and all must have prizes."' "

I expect most of you have heard, too, that well-known saying: 'As dead as the Dodo.' Now, would you believe it, not long ago I actually saw a Dodo. It was not a live one, of course; for the Dodo is dead, and nobody has seen a real live one for over two hundred years.

Where, then, did I see the Dodo? It was in a museum, where the bird had a glass case all to itself, with an interesting notice telling all about it. It was not really the actual bird stuffed, but a very clever model made up from old pictures we have of the Dodo, helped by a skeleton of the real bird. It *was* a funny bird! It looked like a large overgrown turkey, with a big fat body but very tiny wings; and it must have waddled along in a slow and awkward way, because it had such short thick legs. That gives us a hint of how every Dodo came to die.

The birds lived on the island of Mauritius. Before any settlers came, they had a comfortable and lazy time of it. There was no need to fly—so they didn't. There was no need to run—so they didn't. So wings not used became smaller and smaller. Legs which were so lazy became fatter and slower. Then one day a ship came to the island of Mauritius bringing settlers from Portugal. They needed food, and they found those big fat turkeys ever so good to eat. The birds were so easy to catch, too. They couldn't fly away, for

they had forgotten how to fly; and they couldn't run away, because their legs were so short and their big bodies so fat. Indeed, they were so fat that they could hardly get out of their own way. Those settlers had not seen such birds before, and they named them Dodo (*duodo*), which means in Portuguese 'simpleton.' Their scientific name, too, is *didus ineptus*. Some of you who are learning Latin will know easily enough what that means. We have an English word 'inept' which means absurd or silly. That is just what the Dodo was. I mentioned just now that in the museum where I saw that Dodo there was an interesting notice about it. Let me tell you part of it:

'THE DODO IS EXHIBITED HERE AS ILLUSTRATING QUITE A SERIOUS PRINCIPLE: THAT IN WILD NATURE THE CREATURE WHICH FINDS ITSELF IN EASY SURROUNDINGS AND ALLOWS ITS POWERS TO FALL INTO DISUSE IS LIKELY TO BE EXTERMINATED WHEN FACED WITH NEW AND MORE EXACTING CONDITIONS.'

Jesus was always speaking about the folly of the lazy folk. You remember that story He told about the lazy man who hid his lord's money in the earth. 'Thou wicked and slothful servant.' There was another story, too, about those careless girls who took their lamps but then forgot all about the oil for them! What simpletons! Just like the Dodo! Yes, the lazy are lost. They lose their games. They lose their exams. They lose their jobs. They lose their good name.

It is the workers who win through. It is the plodders who find the joy of good success. One of our greatest missionaries, William Carey, a scholar of world-wide renown, began life as a cobbler. Toward the end of his career he wrote: 'I can plod. That is my only genius. I can persevere. To this I owe everything.' There is no other way. And so, 'whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might.'

With Open Eyes:

An Address for the Holidays.

BY THE REVEREND S. GREER, M.A., AYR.

'Open thou mine eyes.'—Ps 119¹⁸.

A well-known writer, G. K. Chesterton, describes something we would think very funny. You go

into his house in London, and find him busily engaged in packing his bag. 'I see you're going on holiday,' you say; 'where are you going?' 'To London,' he replies, tightening a strap. 'I suppose it is not necessary to remind you that this is London,' you answer, looking at him queerly. 'No,' is his quiet reply, 'but I cannot see it. I've got so used to it that I no longer see this place as I ought to. I'm practically blind to all that is interesting and wonderful here; it might as well not be there. The only way to get back to it all is to go somewhere else for a time. I'm going to wander here and there, and look on strange towns and other scenes till I can see these familiar things as they really are. So I'm going to London by way of Brighton, or Edinburgh, or some other route.'

And, of course, you do come by and by not to see things you are always looking at. Where's the nearest fire-alarm? You don't know, though you pass it every day. You can look at things until presently you don't see them. Sometimes we don't see things because we're too near to them; we need to get away from them a bit before we see them aright. There's that little wood close to your home. You never thought anything about it except that it's a great place for hide-and-seek. But one day a man comes along with an easel, and a box of paints and brushes, and sits down in front of it. 'Dear me,' you say, as you look over his shoulder at the finished picture, 'is that our wood?' for there are silver birches dreaming beside the water, or a group of pine-trees dark and high. The artist has lent you his eyes, so to speak, that you may see them.

Or there is your home. You never noticed how carefully things were arranged for your comfort, from the moment you unwillingly tumble out of bed until the last possible minute when you say 'Good-night.' You never thought how, though there were holes in the heels of your stockings nearly every day, there never were any next morning. You just had a comfy feeling, and went on counting on people to do things for you, until one day you came down with a thud because they weren't there to lean on. That was the day the doctor came to see Mother, and ordered her a fortnight's rest away from home. What a fortnight! The things that went wrong; nothing was ever right! You could never find things, though you knew where you *had* put them, and you were late for school. Who had found them for you before? Then you lost marks in your class because your writing was bad, because your pencils weren't sharpened, because—Who sharpened them for you before? And you caught a dreadful cold, and

sniffed all through those summer days, because nobody told you to change your shoes when you came in wet. Who—but the thing is too painful even to remember. What a hug Mummy got when she came back home! And she had been there all those years, and you hadn't seen her!

Well now, that's why we go on holiday. You will see strange and interesting sights, perhaps. People may talk differently in the place you go to live at, making quite different mistakes in pronunciation from yours. Other boys will do things in a way you're not used to, and play new games, and it will all be very exciting and wonderful. You don't want to be like the silly cat that went up to London to see the Queen, and spent its time instead doing what it could just as well have done at home—chasing a mouse under a chair! You must see all that's strange and wonderful wherever you go.

And yet the most strange and wonderful thing of all may be the coming home to find home quite different. 'Open thou mine eyes,' prayed the Psalmist. He hadn't been seeing things as he ought; he had got so used to the marvellous things about him that there might as well have been nothing to look at. It would be a really wonderful thing if we were to come back with open eyes to see how much we have to be thankful for: our home-folk, with all their love and care, our school, our church and Sunday school, and, most of all, Jesus.

You remember the story of Elisha and his companion, how they were trapped in Dothan, and the lad was afraid they were going to be cut off by their enemies. Then Elisha prayed, and the lad's eyes were opened, and he saw how near God's help had been all the time. If you're in difficulty or trouble of any kind, and can't see a way out, just send up to God this sudden prayer: 'Open thou mine eyes.' Why, then, you will see that you are not alone, but that the Lord Jesus is standing by you, looking down into your face.

The 'Egypt's' Gold.

By THE REVEREND P. N. BUSHILL, B.A., ORPINGTON.
'The Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost.'—Lk 19¹⁰.

The other day there steamed into Plymouth harbour a small but very courageous vessel—the *Artiglio*: she bore in her bosom some gold and silver which she had fished up from the bottom of the Atlantic Ocean. Her story is one of great pluck and patience, unique in the annals of the sea.

It was ten years ago that the liner *Egypt* sank

after a collision in a fog—the seaman's worst enemy—at the top of the Bay of Biscay, thirty miles away from the mainland. She bore a very precious cargo, including five tons of gold and forty-three tons of silver. All hope of her recovery was abandoned, as she lay at the bottom of the sea at a depth of over four hundred feet: divers, owing to the pressure of the water on their rubber suits, had not previously been able to work at a depth lower than one hundred feet. The cargo had been insured, and the boat being a total loss, the insurance companies paid over the compensation, amounting to about a million pounds.

A short time afterwards, two men met together in Kent, and talked over the possibility of saving the gold. They felt that it might be possible to raise it from the wreck with a new kind of diving apparatus, although all the experts who had been consulted said that it was quite impossible. In the end, however, an Italian firm who had already experimented with a new kind of steel diving apparatus, instead of the usual rubber one, obtained the contract for this hitherto impossible task.

The first job was to *find* the *Egypt*; and six months in 1929, and three more months in 1930, were spent in *seeking* for it, dragging wire chains across the bottom of the ocean for fifty square miles. How difficult it is to find anything at sea, with no landmark to guide; how impossible to find anything at the bottom of the sea! However, patience was rewarded, and at length in August 1930 the wreck was discovered, and the divers commenced their work.

Then at the end of 1930 a tragedy occurred: this brave ship with nearly all its occupants was destroyed when engaged on another hazardous enterprise! The Italians were not to be thwarted, however, and a new ship, named like her fore-runner the *Artiglio*, was commissioned, and fresh volunteers came forward to man her. Throughout last summer the work continued. The gold was in the bullion room, right in the heart of the vessel, and four strong decks of the *Egypt* had to be broken through by the lowering of bombs into right positions and then exploding them by means of electricity. Extreme patience and perseverance were necessary. The diver in his steel cage could not use his hands or feet; he could only see through the windows in his head-piece, and that dimly, and then by means of telephone give instructions to his comrades on deck on the *Artiglio*. Bit by bit the way had to be broken through until the diver at last could descend right into the bullion room. Directed by telephone the steel grab continually

descended and closed its iron claws with a snap on whatever it could find: at first nothing but wood and rubbish, then some silks, then some paper, some rupee notes—and then, at last—gold! When the first gold was lifted on to the deck of the *Artiglio* there was great rejoicing, cheers of delight, and caps waved in the air! And then do you know what the commander of the vessel did? He called the men together, and asked for silence while they remembered their dead comrades who had given their lives in this hazardous work. Does not this devout act of remembrance stand out, with their courage and patient perseverance, as one of the most thrilling things of a very thrilling story?

And as I have read this story I have been reminded of a yet more wonderful story, a story of even yet greater courage, and more lasting patience. Jesus said, 'I am come to seek and to save that which was lost,' and in seeking and saving that which was lost He gave His own life! What a sacrifice was there! At what a cost have we been saved! And then how patiently Jesus still seeks that which is lost. The divers have been seeking for many months, but Jesus has been seeking for many years. He is seeking every boy and girl here. When He finds even one—more precious to Him than much fine gold—He tells us in His Word, there is great rejoicing even in heaven above. And don't you think it is fitting that we should follow the example of those thankful divers, and in the midst of our rejoicing just call for a moment's silence, and in our hearts remember Him who came to seek and to save us, and who in so doing gave His life for us?

The Christian Year.

THIRTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Things Spiritual in a Mechanical Age.

'Look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen.'—2 Co 4¹⁸.

It is a very interesting fact that whole nations are liable to moods. There was a time in Athens when the whole nation seemed to have passed into a philosophical mood, and the talk of the streets was about being and appearance and such things. There was a time in the fourth century when the nations round the Mediterranean seemed to have been in a theological mood, and their common talk was about the mysteries of the Trinity. That is a mood which has visited other nations at other times since, and perhaps especially the Scottish nation. And it is at least an open question whether a

theological mood is at all the same thing as a religious mood.

Then there have been times in Italy, in France, in Germany, and in Britain, at least in some measure, when music, painting, and the drama were the outstanding interests of ordinary men and women—when the production of a new and great work of art was felt to be a more important event than a change of government, which, very likely, was really the case. It would seem that progress is never progress all along the line at any one time. First one activity of the human spirit and then another leaps to the forefront to claim the attention of the race.

Now sometime during the last century the mood of scientific interest began to claim the attention of Western peoples, and since then an ever-growing number of people in Europe and America have come to live in that mood. The modern side in our schools has become the popular side, and the new universities of this country give a place to scientific studies such as threatens to push the old kind of culture into the background. Physics, chemistry, mineralogy, metallurgy, biology, physiology, mathematics, and astronomy are apparently the really popular studies of those who are intellectually inclined. And the outstanding result of it all has been an enormous amount of mechanical invention, till this might almost be called the age of mechanics.

In our homes we rely on electric light, vacuum cleaners, sewing machines, and think them only half-furnished unless we have also a telephone and a wireless set, and perhaps a gramophone. Our offices are equipped with typewriters, calculating machines, and cash registers, if not with phonographs. We go out into the streets and count on being able to use electric trams or motor buses or underground tubes. Many people consider a private car almost essential, and a growing number of daring spirits are unhappy unless they can fly in the air. Our farmers use motor tractors and mechanical milking machines. Very few people fail to go through a period when they make a hobby of photography. Almost every week some new process in manufacture is discovered by which human toil is lessened and the production of goods for common use might at least be cheapened.

We are often told that all this means only materialistic advance, and that we would be better without it. We are told it means that the spirit of man is starved, and life is cheapened. Mr. Gandhi, for instance, with his passionate concern for the spiritual welfare of India, would seem to desire a return to life on its old simple terms.

But it seems plain that this vast advance of man

in the control of Nature belongs to his true evolution. We cannot but rejoice in the triumphant exercise of human brains which lies behind this mechanical advance and believe that ultimately the perfect control of matter may be found to serve spiritual ends. The perfection of the mechanical arrangements in an organ does not necessarily mean that it will produce true music, but it does mean that a true musician has a better chance to produce real music, and is helped to give expression to what is in his spirit.

But excessive concentration on any one aspect of reality is very apt to put men and women into a state of mind in which they lose all sense of the value and meaning of other aspects. Darwin confessed that after years of concentration on purely scientific questions, he had lost his power to appreciate beauty in poetry or music. That is the peculiar danger of our age—that we should come to feel that things spiritual are just unreal.

When a man has spent a whole week in thinking about such things as carburettors, or camshafts, or sleeve valves, and is then asked to consider spiritual values, he is very apt to say, 'What are they?' He is very apt to feel that they are quite unreal. A good many people can only get an idea at all of spiritual realities through the use of mechanical analogies. So they think of prayer as a kind of telephoning. They describe love as an instance of magnetism, and call communion with God a case of self-hypnotism. What cannot be described by the use of mechanical terms is to such people just unreal.

Now it is not only in connexion with religion that that turns out to be very fatal to the worth and beauty of life. Beauty itself is unreal to people in that state of mind. So is virtue. So is a thing like inspiration, or a power like loyalty. Above all, so is love. All these things are actually described, in much modern literature, as mere sentiments. And it is implied that sentiments are things of which a sensible man will get rid. That is why modern life, on its emotional side, is starved. What is needed with such people is not a new philosophy of life—not a new theology or a more reasonable view of religion. What is needed is that something deeply buried in them should come to life. They say that religious services bore them, or seem to them useless. Of course they do. Religious services, good and bad alike, are centred on the fact of God, and consist in essence in a setting of the mind and soul toward God. Of course all that seems dull, wearisome, and even silly to those for whom the thought of God has no meaning. There

are people who say that they are not attracted by Jesus Christ. Well, of course they are not. Jesus Christ has nothing to say to them about how to get an extra two miles to the gallon out of their cars, or about how to tune in to get Madrid or Vienna. He has things to tell us about God—wonderful and glorious things. But if the word God only suggests to us a mad dream of a fool, then, of course, Jesus will not interest us. Christ calls, but if the part of us that might respond to that call is dead, then, of course, Christ calls in vain. Yes, it is the awakening of something that is in many deeply buried which alone can change the situation.

Perhaps the most important point to realize here is that we are all apt to fall into this disastrous habit of neglecting the things that really give worth and beauty to life without any sense of wrongdoing. There is nothing specially wrong in being so fascinated by the engine of our motor car that we think of it in the intervals of work and when we lie in bed at night. There is no obvious sin in using our imagination and our thought to try to perfect some mechanical appliance, or in worrying for hours over some knotty problem in construction. But what about the worth of life as a whole! To get the real value out of finer and greater things than these, we have to attend to them. Mechanical things are all right in their place, but do let us take care that every now and then we push them all on to one side, and make room for other and greater things, otherwise our own greatest powers may atrophy.

When people are chiefly mechanically minded, or let interest in merely material things absorb their attention, human life loses its warmth and beauty. It loses its true flavour. It ceases to have power to satisfy. It leaves people restless, unhappy, and a prey to moods and longings which they do not understand.

And that is the peculiar disease of our time.

And the cure? Well, quite simply, the cure is to take time in life to think about Jesus Christ. If we are in any sort of tune with Him, we find our sense of beauty being quickened, and our love of human beings, and our appreciation of all the intimate lovely things that really make life both noble and happy. That is the way He affects those who live in His society.

But it takes time. We have to refuse to allow our attention to be held all day and every day by the things which lie on the surface of life. We have to be still. We have a faculty which is generally called the soul—it is a power to see things unseen, and hear things unspoken, and love things which have no worldly value. Modern life is always

threatening to bury that power and paralyse it. But we can save it. And when we save it, and use it, we begin at once to live a kind of life that has deep, deep power to satisfy, and which never ends.¹

FOURTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Let God Arise.

'Let God arise, let his enemies be scattered.'—Ps 68¹.

This psalm has always been known as the Warrior's Psalm. It was the favourite psalm of the Emperor Charlemagne; when, in November 1812, Napoleon began his famous retreat from Moscow, the Russian Metropolitan in the cathedral of the Kremlin took the first verse of it as his text; it was sung by the Puritan army at the battle of Dunbar; and it has again and again been on the lips of soldiers.

In warfare there is always a desire to enlist whatever sanctions are thought likely to be of any use. Chiefest of these (as some think), among these (as others put it) is the sanction of religion. But there are, as Newman once said, two ways of touching the ark of God, 'as patrons and as sons.' There has sometimes been a stronger desire 'to have God on our side' than 'to be ourselves on God's side'; a desire to harness spiritual forces to a national end, or within the nation to a political end, rather than to discover and pursue the direction, whatever it may be, in which the Divinely ordered course of events is really tending. Perhaps of all peoples the old Israelites were the most frank in their assumption that 'our cause is the cause of God.' There was some excuse for them. They were surrounded by other nations, more powerful, often much more highly civilized, but openly idolatrous; theirs was a national religion; with them Church and State were coterminous and practically identical; the only way in which strangers could come in any effective way to share their faith was by some kind of political naturalization; they were the true Church and the holy nation, and all the rest of the world were the Gentiles; it was not unnatural that they should think that God had spoken His last word to them, and that they had the sole rights of publication.

The Old Testament is the story of how this simple confidence was, not shaken, still less broken, but gradually deepened, solidified, put on a more sure foundation and converted into a better kind of confidence. In early days a verse like 'Let God arise, let his enemies be scattered' would have meant—'Let us have a great victory in the battle, and kill all, or as many as possible, of the enemy.'

¹ A. Herbert Gray, *Jesus, and the Art of Living*, 61.

The survivors will then be our slaves, and both they and the neighbouring nations will say, "What a wonderful people the sons of Israel are, and what a wonderful God the God of Israel is!" Later, it would grow towards a deeper and more ethical meaning, something like this: 'Let the Name of God, with that knowledge of the revelation of the character of God which that Name implies, come more and more to rule the life of men; let His way be known upon earth, and His saving health among all nations.'

Oliver Cromwell is reported to have said once to a group of ministers: 'I beseech you, gentlemen, by the mercies of God, to remember that it is possible that you may be mistaken.' He meant that the mercies of God are the sure thing, that God always is right, but we may not always recognize what God means or is doing. The best kind of faith in God is a faith which is qualified—that is, not weakened, but strengthened by the recollection of just that possibility. The world that God has created is not a carefully constructed labyrinth, where there is one way out, and one way only. It is more like a family, or a city, or a nation, which can develop in a thousand ways. At countless points in the development there is a better and a worse, sometimes there is a sharply contrasted right and wrong, sometimes there are many equally good possibilities. But always progress will depend on the extent to which the members of the community are willing and able to avail themselves of the guiding and overruling, but not compelling Providence of God.

'Let God arise, let his enemies be scattered' does not really suggest that we have only to carry the Ark of God at the head of the procession, and the walls of Jericho will immediately fall down. It means that the world is God's world, that human life has a meaning and is a thing capable of being used aright—the Incarnation of Christ is the Divine warrant of this—and that there is such a thing as the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and therefore when God arises, when the ideals that are included under the name of God are asserted, when the methods that are consistent with the glory of God are employed, when the ends that are part of the purpose of God are sought, then the enemies of God will be scattered. This was satisfied in its first context by the actual death of ungodly, or supposed ungodly, individuals. But is that really any good?

If the uprising in the minds of all of a truer and nobler idea of God leads the cruel to forget their cruelty, the lustful to desire better things, the selfish to remember others, and the mean-spirited to be-

come generous; if the uplifting of God in the imagination of men's minds causes the sordid things to fade away, to have no soil in which to thrive, and no public to enjoy them, to lose their attraction and their reason for existence, then there is ground for saying: 'He is our God, even the God of whom cometh salvation: God is the Lord by whom we escape death.'

Now, the main lesson of the Bible, in this instance of the Old Testament, is that this is the first thing that has to be done. Let God arise. Determination of policy will follow later. Many of the Bible people paid lip-service only to this order of events. They were really making their own plans in a worldly way, and it was only considerations of decency and the pressure of public opinion that made them add: 'Of course, we must not omit to implore the Divine blessing on our enterprise, so that in all our works, begun, continued, and ended in Him, we may glorify His holy name.'

But the Old Testament as we have it, representing doubtless the survival of the better of two points of view and the better of the two elements in the Jewish nation, declares that 'Let God arise' is the first thing to be said and the dominating factor in the prescription. To-day we often make it a sort of last resort. Thus, in a perplexity, 'I wonder if religion would be any good. Well, shall we try it? It can't do any harm, and it may do some good.' Whereas, if faith in God is a real thing, our concern with God will not only occupy the centre of the stage, but it will cover all the ground.

The religion which will win its way and maintain its hold in the world is one that is carried out from the sanctuary into life. Our failure is a double failure—a failure of some of the activity that is at the centre to get out into the world at large, and a failure of some of the life that is in the world at large to find the centre. Somehow the common meanings of the words 'ecclesiastical' and 'worldly' have both become much smaller than they ought to be. 'Ecclesiastical' ought to mean 'Brotherly-hearted believer in the principle of fellowship'; and a 'worldly' person ought to be interested in the whole world, and where it came from, and what is behind it, and what it all means. It seems that the blood needs to circulate more freely both in the veins and in the arteries.

Some do not know that God is the true centre of a life. They are fortunate if they have something at the centre which, though they may not know it, is a part of God. They are fortunate if some determining thing like Brotherhood, or Science, or Public Spirit, or some other good loyalty, shapes their

character. But they would be infinitely more fortunate if they knew the true name of that which guides them. Jacob, wrestling with the unknown stranger, said, 'Tell me, I pray thee, what is thy name.' The idea was that to know the name of a supernatural being gave a certain power over him. The spirit was bound to appear if summoned with the correct formula of invocation. But in the story of Jacob what happens is that Jacob himself wins a new name. He is no longer Jacob, 'the supplanter'; he is Israel, 'one who perseveres with God,' and the incident is a turning-point in his life.

May we not say that those who have had a hitherto unrecognized, unidentified centre to their life, when they find out its name, if they even want to find out its name, will themselves receive a new name, and, by degrees, a new character? Let God arise, and there will be the less space for idols. Let God arise, and there will be the less appetite for substitutes. Let God arise, and wholesomeness will sterilize the poisons and reinforce all good desires. When God arises, faint elementary desires, that before knew nothing of God or even of themselves, are quickened, like little seeds not planted so deep beneath the surface of the ground but that they can hear the call of spring. Let God arise, and let His enemies be scattered—yes, that is part of it. But better and more to be desired, let all things that are friendly to His cause find themselves, find one another, and find God, and then, though they have lien among the pots, yet shall they be as the wings of a dove that is covered with silver wings, and her feathers like gold.¹

FIFTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Comfort of Christ.

'If there is therefore any comfort in Christ . . . '—Ph 2¹ (R.V.).

In the life of the late Dr. John Watson ('Ian Maclaren') we find the great preacher makes this confession, 'If I had to begin life over again, I would make mine a more comforting ministry.' He had learned by experience that whatever else life may be, it is always a supremely pathetic thing. He had the vision of a humanity sorely stricken, of a world in great need, of a heart deeply wounded somewhere; and he would fain deliver a message that cheers and strengthens.

We sometimes recoil from the notion of comfort—it is that we have imbibed a wrong conception of it. We have regarded it as something unmanly; as a confession of weakness; a soothing and coddling

that take all the grit out of character; a numbing anæsthetic that betokens a certain cowardliness and shrinking in the presence of pain. Very different is the Biblical conception. The New Testament idea of comfort is that of rousing, heartening, strengthening, putting new spirit and vigour into a man, so that after bathing in this spiritual atmosphere he emerges twice a man, and is ready for whatever may befall.

'If there be any comfort in Christ . . . ' Has Paul any doubt about it? On the contrary, this is an 'if' of assured and absolute certainty. It is as though a man should say, 'If there be any light in the sun . . . ' Why, it is the very source and centre of light. Paul knows there is comfort in Christ. He is not at this moment the keen logician or the profound theologian or the intellectual debater; he is in a softened mood, and he lets his heart go in a burst of tenderness. Has he not been comforted in Christ? Why, yes, over and over again—never more richly than during his recent imprisonment; but the comfort has not weakened him, it has poured such strength into his heart that he can say, 'I can do all things in him that strengtheneth me.' It is the tone of the conqueror. This is pre-eminently a joyful letter, only one thing is wanting and that is the unanimity and harmony of the Church; if the Philippians were only of the same mind as himself, 'having the same love, being of one accord,' then his joy would indeed be full to overflowing. This man has found something worth sharing. Is not that one of the tests by which we may try the value of our faith? Have we found it to be something worth sharing, something indeed that *must* be shared, because of the abounding force that is in it? Here we have no spectral saint of the cloister; we are face to face with a robust man of the world—using that much-abused phrase in its noblest, richest, fullest sense. This man is in possession of a vision which he feels belongs to humanity. To him faith is a tree that can only bloom and fructify in one atmosphere—the clear bracing air of the love revealed in Jesus Christ. It is there alone that our differences can find a happy reconciliation; there alone that our problems can be successfully solved.

The comfort of which Paul speaks, which he desires all to share and to test for themselves, is comfort of a peculiar quality. It is a comfort 'in Christ.' This is to say, it is comfort that comes to us through a living personality; not only so, but through a personality that makes God real, renders Him accessible. It is a comfort 'manifest in the flesh.' We all know what this is and how much it means on lower levels. Stevenson speaks of those

¹ S. C. Carpenter, *The House of Pilgrimage*, 106.

happy, cheerful, buoyant spirits whose entry into a room is as though another candle had been lighted. To be such an one as that, what a high privilege ! what a worthy ambition ! We are in the dumps some night, dispirited, limp, uneasy, feeling as if nothing mattered much and life were not worth while ; when a familiar footstep is heard outside, a well-known voice rings cheerily, the door opens, and a friend comes in whose presence banishes the ' blues,' and in the interchange of thought you become a different man. We have been comforted by means of a living personality. Given the right man the prescription never fails. It is personality that brings the touch of power. What, then, must be the uplifting and the arousing that come through the richest Personality of all, the Christ who is the image of the unseen God ! He brings the tonic that recreates a man, and enables him to stand up in all the glory of a new self.

This Christ-given strength is of a kind that admits of considerable variety. Some of us could witness that Christ comforts the *heart*. He enters into the region of the affections, and links our human loves to the eternal world. We are knit together here in this dim world for a short time in various relationships—husband and wife, parent and child, brother and sister, friend and friend ; but we know not how long they may last ; some day the inevitable separation comes, and then the blank, the emptiness, the solitude that for the moment make the strongest reel as from a lightning stroke. But supposing Christ has been in those relationships ; supposing a common faith has made them twice blessed, then the separation is but momentary, when time is considered in relation to eternity ; the threads of life are not broken, they are extended ; hope stretches beyond the darkness and the silence, and we realize that such loves as ours are of the very nature of God and share His eternal life. Thus does Christ bring comfort to the heart.

There are some, too, who could bear witness that Christ comforts the *mind*. He enters freely into our intellectual life. We need not fear to bring our problems into His presence. Our doubts, our black thoughts, our mental anxieties and apprehensions are not experiences from which the light of Christ is excluded ; it is only in His light that their torture may be borne and their distress relieved. Is it not comfort to know that Christ is fully our brother in this, that He too has faced these spectres of the mind, and come out of the darkness praying ? What was the passion of Gethsemane if not an intolerable mental agony ? The forces of the world were gathered there to crush Him, but He

overcame the sharpness of that death. He had not been fully human had He not endured the strife of thought and the pressure of problems that arise from the limitation of a human personality. But the mind of Christ was a light no darkness could eclipse or quench ; from it we may light our lamps ; rather He Himself becomes a lamp to our feet and a light to our path.

There is a mighty host, also, who can bear witness that Christ comforts the *conscience*. We all of us know the fellowship of weakness, the brotherhood of shame. In those dark sad hours when resolve has broken down, when the will has given way, when we have wept over sin and done again the sin that made us weep, the only power that has quenched the flame of conscience, and healed us of our self-despisings, and restored us to our self-respect, has been the pardoning, quickening, reviving touch of Christ. Interpret it as you please, the solid, comforting, eternal fact is here—that in this Man there is forgiveness of sins ; He *takes away* the sin of the world.¹

SIXTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Self-Sacrifice.

' And whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain.'—Mt 5⁴¹.

The Sermon on the Mount, of which our text forms part, is the delight and the despair of all Christian men and women. The Beatitudes, with which it opens, are quoted with admiration by men who reject the name of Christian, but the requirements of a Christian life taught in some verses, and notably in vv.³⁹⁻⁴², are so strict, severe, and apparently impossible and impracticable that many have not hesitated to say that no one can attempt to obey them.

These very hard precepts are given to be illustrations of the one rule that Christians are not to struggle against, or defend themselves against, wrongs done to themselves. This is what is said : ' Resist not wrong-doing : but whosoever smiteth thee on the right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man would go to law with thee and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also. And whosoever shall compel thee to go one mile, go with him twain. Give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away.'

These are the four precepts—two of which, the first and the fourth, relate to private conduct between man and man ; and two, the second and

¹ W. A. Mursell, *Sermons on Special Occasions*, 140.

the third, to public behaviour, to duties connected with the State, or the ordinary regulations of the administration of the country.

Let us try to get at the exact meaning of these words—the very meaning that an intelligent hearer who was among the crowd would take out of them. To do so, two things must be remembered—one of which applies to all the four precepts and the other of which belongs to our text by itself.

1. Oriental teachers make large use of short parables, proverbs, and what are called apothegms or wise sayings—familiar to the people whom they are trying to instruct—and throw their teaching into that form. Oriental peoples can scarcely understand our direct and definite Western teaching. They are not accustomed to it. It is not familiar to them. The words fall on their ears—words quite plain and intelligible to us—and yet fail to make any impression on their understanding. So much is this the case that many a missionary has failed to make his hearers understand what we should call the plain truths of the gospel till he has learned a collection of Arabic or Hindu or Chinese or Swahili proverbs and wise sayings, and, when he has illustrated what he has to say by these familiar sayings, he has then been able to make the people understand him. So common was this mode of teaching in Bible lands that there is one book of the Bible which is nothing but a collection of these sentences of condensed and popular wisdom.

Now, it is very difficult to describe a proverb or wise popular saying; but there is this to be said about it, that it is seldom or never universally true, and does not hold good in every case. It is often an instance of an extreme case of the universal truth which it teaches. So much is this the case that you may have wise sayings which are almost contradictory. You have an example in the Book of Proverbs (26⁴): 'Answer not a fool according to his folly, lest thou also be like unto him'; and v.⁵: 'Answer a fool according to his folly, lest he be wise in his own conceit.'

Now precepts about non-resistance belong to this class of wise sayings. They are all true. In most cases it is neither wise nor Christian to resist an ill done to us, or to go to law, or to refuse to help a neighbour. But what we have are extreme cases—instances in the extremest form to be imagined of the general principle of Christian love to our neighbour.

The general direction for Christian life which was meant to be conveyed in these four precepts might be put in the two sentences: Never seek to exact full justice for yourself, but be ready to give more

than full justice to another. Never let any self-seeking appear in your demand for justice.

2. To come now to the particular selected precept. The word translated 'compel' is a very unusual one, and occurs only twice in the New Testament—in this verse and in Mk 15²¹, where we are told that the soldiers who led Jesus forth to crucify Him 'compelled' Simon the Cyrenian to carry the cross of Christ.

If the full meaning of the word is to be expressed, the text would read: 'And if anyone in the service of the State impresses or requisitions you to convey him one mile, go with him two.' The allusion is to the post or State transit system then in use all over the East, and borrowed by the Roman Empire from the old Persian postal system. All along the great highways were farms held by men from the State on condition that they supplied food, guides, and conveyance to all imperial couriers, or to all travellers who journeyed holding official orders for travellers.

It was a service due to the State, and finds its modern equivalent in our taxes for the upkeep of roads. What Jesus says is: If any authorized person insists on your furnishing him with road service, with guidance or conveyance, go not merely the mile you are obliged to go, but go two miles. It is an extreme instance of the general principle that every Christian man is to do ungrudgingly what he is required by his country to do.

Our Lord's command is a very practical one, and one which casts light on our relations to certain duties which we are apt sometimes to consider are scarcely duties at all—or at least duties which are entirely outside the line of Christian precept.

No one likes to pay taxes; and many people seem to think there is little harm in hoodwinking the tax-gatherer or the custom-house officer. But apply the general principle—'Bear each other's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ'—and we shall see that, if we get out of our appointed share, instead of bearing each other's burdens, we are really shifting our own to our neighbour's shoulders. And what our Lord says is that it is far more Christ-like, far better, to pay more than our own share than by fraud or fancied cleverness to make other people pay it for us. Better far to go the two miles than to shirk our plain duty of going one.

We must go a little deeper, however, to understand the full significance of this precept of Jesus. The precepts are by express statement all instances of ways to avoid the natural habit of resisting, violently or slyly, what is, or feels to us to be, a wrong done to us. And this duty of non-resistance is only one case of the universal Christian law,

that we are to love our neighbour as ourselves. We are all linked together in neighbourliness. We are children of the one Father and brethren of the one Christ.

Jesus has put a brotherhood, a common family relationship, into men which did not exist before He came, and which cannot exist without Him. He has done it by coming into our common life and by taking more than His share of its burdens—by dying for us. The death of Jesus—His burden-bearing for each and every one of us—is the centre round which all these new thoughts of family and community gather. It is that supreme manifestation of Divine love which has awakened the love not only for Jesus, but for all for whom, as for us, Christ died.

So, that life and death of Jesus is the type and basis of all our Christian duties. Every Christian duty, especially when it brings with it some burden which might have otherwise been shirked, is a reflection of that supreme act which was finished on Calvary. This lends both a glory and a deep responsibility to what would otherwise appear a

trifling matter of human conduct, and whether we start from the Christian man nobly restraining his passion for revenge for some assault on his person, or from the Christian citizen gladly performing his share of a citizen's life by paying ungrudgingly and gladly the burdens which citizenship lays upon him, we are led gradually but surely to the deification of them all in the scenes of the Passion of our Lord, who by His life and death knit us into the common brotherhood of the children of our Father who is in heaven.

Thus, though the comparison seems impossible, there is a real connexion between filling up our income-tax paper honestly and the suffering and crucifixion of Jesus for us. He seems to say: If any one compel you to go one mile, go two miles with him. I not only fulfilled in My life the duties laid on Me by you, but I took more than My share of the common burdens, and died for your sake. And I have left you an example that you should follow in Mysteps.¹

¹ T. M. Lindsay, *College Addresses*, 143.

Did Christ eat the Passover with His Disciples? or, The Synoptics versus John's Gospel.

BY THE REVEREND W. M. CHRISTIE, D.D., MOUNT CARMEL BIBLE SCHOOL, HAIFA.

Was the Supper at which the Lord Jesus instituted our Communion Service the actual Passover, celebrated on the 15th of Nisan, or was it a semi-paschal meal, eaten in anticipation on the 14th of that month? That is the question simply stated. To us with our frequent celebrations of the Lord's Supper, and with our use of a Calendar that is out of touch with the Jewish, this may seem a matter of little significance; but at different periods in the past this question has convulsed the Church, and at the present moment it is one of the most important points connected with New Testament Criticism.

About the year A.D. 155 Polycarp of Smyrna visited Rome, and there came into touch with Anicetus. Their association with one another brought into prominence that there was a difference between them in the date of their celebration of the Memorial of Christ's death at the Passover Season. The practice in Asia Minor was that the

Supper be observed on the evening of the 14th of Nisan, that is, after the sunset of the 13th, at which time the new day began according to Jewish and Old Testament usage. Polycarp maintained that he had so kept the Feast with the Apostle John. Irenæus, an Asiatic, and disciple of Polycarp, followed his teacher.

On the other hand, the Roman practice was that the celebration take place one day later, that is, on the evening with which the 15th of Nisan commenced; and in support of this Anicetus appealed to the unbroken Roman practice since Apostolic times. From the date of observance, the two parties were named the Quartodecimans and Quintodecimans. Disputation went on till the year A.D. 325, after which the Roman practice prevailed throughout the Empire.

The same controversy appears once again in the sixth and seventh centuries between the representatives of the Culdee and the Roman Churches. To

settle the dispute a Synod was held at Streonshalch, now Whitby in England, in the year A.D. 662. In favour of the 15th of the month 'the Roman clergy urged the authority of Peter; but Bishop Colman, and the Culdee presbyters, good simple men, reason as if the authority of John the apostle had been of as much weight as the other.' No agreement was then reached, but the Culdees were forced into conformity in 717.

The problem has been approached in a variety of ways. Sometimes it is quite frankly stated that the documents are irreconcilable, and that either the Synoptics or John has made a mistake. Other attempts at solution generally seek to maintain the credit of Scripture, and with this end in view they try to harmonize the conflicting statements. Sometimes we are told, as indicated above, that the Synoptic position is that Christ, anticipating the true Passover, simply ate a Paschal Meal with His disciples, that in this sense the language of the Passover is applied to the table, and to the incidents connected with it, and that accordingly John, too, is correct in placing the real Passover on the following evening. On the other hand we are occasionally reminded that the designation 'Passover' was applied to the whole feast, and all its meals in the Talmud (Rosh. 5a; Zebach. 99b), and that John's references might well apply to much beyond the Passover itself. Here, too, we have another effort to make both positions defensible.

Still, in spite of all harmonizing, apparent contradictions remain; the difficulty is felt to be a real one, and there is a lurking suspicion that something is wrong. Let us examine the situation, and consider the leading evidences. At the close of the 13th day of Nisan, after the sunset, at which time the 14th commenced, there was the 'purging out of the old leaven.' On the following afternoon, still the 14th, the Passover lambs were sacrificed. That evening after sunset, when the 15th began, the Passover Supper was eaten. Now there can be no question that Christ ate His Supper on the Thursday night, and was crucified on the Friday, and the matter accordingly resolves itself into this: Was that day, beginning on Thursday at sunset, and closing on Friday at sunset, the 15th of Nisan, and consequently the first day of the Passover Feast, or was it only the 14th?

On neither side is there any lack of evidence. Let us consider the Synoptics. We read, 'And the first day of unleavened bread, when they killed the passover, his disciples said unto him, Where wilt thou that we go and prepare that thou

mayest eat the passover?' (Mk 14¹²; cf. Mt 26¹⁷). In the same connexion Lk 22⁷ reads, 'Then came the day of unleavened bread, when the passover must be killed.' With a view to securing the room, Christ instructs His messengers to say, 'I will keep the passover at thy house with my disciples' (Mt 26¹⁸); 'Where is the guestchamber, where I shall eat the passover with my disciples?' (Lk 22¹¹). Then the three Synoptists are unanimous in the statement, 'They made ready the passover' (Mt 26¹⁹, Mk 14¹⁶, Lk 22¹³). In addition, the Lord Himself speaks of the meal on the table as 'This passover' (Lk 22¹⁵). And, with one remarkable exception to be later explained, there was on the table everything connected with the Passover Supper—the wine, the unleavened bread, the mortar or 'sop,' and evidently the Great Hallel was sung, according to custom (Mt 26³⁰). The statement as to the day, when the preparation was made, being the first day of unleavened bread, definitely excludes anything like an anticipated supper, even if that had been legal, which it was not. Clearly to Christ Himself, and to the Twelve, as well as to the Synoptic writers, the meal of which they partook was in the fullest sense the Passover Supper.

On the other hand, John is equally clear and definite. He places the whole matter 'Before the feast of the passover' (Jn 13¹). Judas is supposed to have gone to buy something for the feast, or to give something to the poor (13²⁹), while the Temple guards went to Gethsemane with lanterns and torches and weapons (18³). Now these things could not have taken place had the Passover feast begun. Judas would have found it impossible to buy anything, and the action of the guards was clearly illegal, since the Passover was a Sabbath, and the carrying of arms was forbidden on such a day (M., Shab. vi. 4). Then we are told that the accusers of Christ 'went not into the judgment hall, lest they should be defiled; but that they might eat the passover' (18²⁸). Later John declares in three separate verses (19¹⁴, 31, 32) that the day of the Crucifixion was the Preparation of the Passover, and that can mean nothing but the 14th of Nisan. In agreement with John we have the statement made in the Babylonian Talmud to the effect that Christ was crucified on 'the evening of the passover' or the 14th of Nisan (Sanhedrin 43a; Amsterdam Edition).

The whole action of the Jewish authorities, too, seems more in agreement with John than with the Synoptics, and the same facts are set forth also by the Synoptics. The first day of the Feast was

officially a Sabbath (Lv 23^{11, 15}), and many things are recorded as being done that were absolutely forbidden on such a day. We have already indicated the carrying of arms. But, even if the precautions necessary to secure a dangerous leader were offered as an excuse, the holding of Courts of Law on the Passover Day would be altogether unjustifiable (M., Betzah v. 2; B., Sanh. 63a). Annas and Caiaphas and their associated priests were evidently anxious, too, to preserve at least a semblance of legality, as appears from their waiting for the day (M., Sanh. iv. 1) before pronouncing sentence. A crucifixion, too, on the 15th of Nisan would be a breach of the Sabbath Law (Sanh. 35a) and although fanaticism and hatred against the Lord Jesus might perhaps explain the haste in carrying out the sentence against Him, it fails to account for the case of the two thieves.

Further support is given to the Johannine position by the apparent laxity or indifference to Sabbath Law of such as we might expect to be strict in such a matter, and the Synoptics themselves record this without note or comment. Joseph of Arimathea actually *bought* fine linen (Mk 15⁴⁶), and the women returning for the burial prepared spices and ointments (Lk 23⁵⁶) and rested the Sabbath Day, according to the commandment. There was evidently a distinction for them between the Friday and the Saturday, and both were equally Sabbaths, if Friday were the first day of the Passover. Another point in favour of John is the regulation in connexion with the Jewish Calendar, usually designated L.O.B.D.O. This is a mnemonic indicating that the first day of the Passover can never happen on the second, fourth, or sixth day of the week, consequently never on Friday.

We have now reached the stage where we can sum up. The evidences for each side are clear and definite, and they seem equally balanced. They leave us in no doubt that Friday, then, was the 15th of Nisan to Christ and the Apostles, and the Synoptics present it as such; but that same day was equally the 14th of Nisan to all the active enemies of Christ, and as such John sets it down in his Gospel. Has either of them made a mistake, as we are often told, or is there any explanation?

Let us in the first place consider the Jewish Rule that the Passover could never fall on Friday. Such has been the case since the Calendar was fixed in the year A.D. 358, and probably for a considerable time before that event. But we have the clearest evidence that at the beginning of the Christian Era there was no such restriction. According to Ex 12¹⁰ what remained of the

Passover until the morning of the 16th of Nisan had to be burned with fire. In the Mishnah (Pes. vii. 10) the direction is however given, that if the 16th fell on the weekly Sabbath, the burning was to find place on the 17th. In such a case the Passover Day, or 15th of Nisan, fell on the Friday, and the Supper would then be eaten on the Thursday evening as set forth by the Synoptics.

Another suggestion has been made through which it was hoped to find a solution of our difficulty, and this also is connected with the arranging of the Calendar before it was finally fixed. We have to remember that all Jewish dates, including, of course, those of the feasts, were determined by observation of the New Moons, at the beginning of the months. Now, the new moon was not visible till from eighteen to thirty-six hours after its 'birth.' Two days might in some cases actually elapse before it was seen. Witnesses were examined, and the evidences were weighed, after which the new moon was announced. The uncertainty attendant on all this procedure has been urged as a ground for thinking that perhaps an explanation of the two days may lie here, but still there is no certainty.

But, in connexion with these reckonings on the New Moons and the Feasts, the Jewish Authorities seem to come to our help. In the Mishnah (Chagigah ii. 4) we learn that there was a section of the people that reckoned the Feast of Pentecost as always falling on the First Day of the week. This meant that the first day of the Passover fell on the seventh of the week, or the Jewish Sabbath (Saturday), and accordingly the Omer or Sheaf had to be presented on the first day of the week. This was the contention of the same party, and it is set forth in the Mishnah, Rosh. ii. 1; Bab., Rosh. 22b; Jer., Rosh. ii. 1, or 10b, in Shit. edition. The position assumed by this party was based on a false interpretation of the expression 'the morrow after the Sabbath' in Lv 23^{11, 15}, in which the weekly Sabbath was understood instead of the First Day of the Feast, which in Scripture is also named a Sabbath. Now we can well understand that if such a regulation were to prevail, the first day of the Passover would not, in the majority of instances, fall on the 15th of the month if correctly reckoned.

Accordingly we learn that this party (who are named Minim, Boethusians, and Tzadukim, all of which are designations of the Sadducean Sect) sought to introduce confusion in the reckonings (M., Rosh. ii. 1), and that this was for the purpose of deceiving the Chachamim, or rabbis of the Pharisaic Party. The whole position is made very

clear in the Tosephta parallel to the Mishnah passage quoted, as also in the Gemara comments in both Talmuds, on the pages already cited. All three passages give a full account of the bribing of two witnesses to give false testimony regarding the New Moon for this very purpose, and the payment of two hundred Zuz or Denars to each of them. One of these, belonging to the Pharisaic Sect, revealed the whole matter, and gave details as to his evidence of having seen the new moon from the neighbourhood of the Good Samaritan Inn (Ma'alce Adummim).

The Jerusalem Talmud tells us in conclusion that the deception in connexion with the reckonings 'was known to the rabbis,' and that the outcome of the matter was that 'these were sitting down (reclining) to-day, and those were sitting down on the morrow' (Jer.; Rosh. 10b).

This exactly agrees with what seems to have been the situation in the year of the Crucifixion. The Passover, according to the natural reckoning, ought to have been celebrated on the Thursday night, but the Sadducean Party, in virtue of their own interpretation, forced it forward to the Friday evening. They ate the Passover after the Crucifixion, as set forth in John's Gospel, while Christ and His associates, who would be mainly of the Pharisaic Party, kept the Feast at the true time, on the Thursday evening, as stated by the Synoptics.

We can thus understand the want of conformity to the demands of a strict Passover, with all its regulations enforced. Confusion and uncertainty in matters of religion invariably bring in laxity, both in public observance, and in the practice of individuals. The Sadducees were in authority, and the multitude would follow them. The markets to a great extent would be open, and purchases could be made till late on the Friday afternoon. In virtue of the disputable date the action of the Temple guards, and the sitting of the Law Courts, would remain unchallenged. In the light that the rabbis give us most of the difficulties of the situation vanish. And if Joseph of Arimathea, and Nicodemus in connexion with the burial, and the women in their preparation of the spices did seem to violate the Sabbath Law, we must remember that the later Rabbinical regulations were only in process of formation. To the persons concerned there were two Sabbaths, one after the other, and the things connected with the burial had to be carried through. It was with the design of meeting such cases as two Sabbaths coming together, that the regulation of L.O.B.D.O. was invented. Further, may we not see in what they did an initial recogni-

tion that Christ was Lord of the Sabbath, and that for them He took precedence in all things?

And when these matters are definitely understood, we get a good deal of illumination on various points connected with the narratives. We are informed in Lk 23⁵¹ that Joseph of Arimathea 'had not consented to the counsel and deed of them.' The words do not suggest, and there is no reason to believe, that he was present at the meeting of the Sanhedrin at all. Any number over twenty-three formed a full quorum, and the Sadducean priests would see to it that to this exceptional meeting men of doubtful attitude were left unsummoned. The verdict, too, 'a man of death' seems to have been by acclamation, 'they ALL condemned him to be guilty of death' (Mk 14⁶⁴). Joseph of Arimathea, as also Nicodemus, as members of the Pharisaic Party, would be in their own homes keeping their own Passover.

Then on that Thursday night, when Judas left the table in the midst of the Passover Meal and went out, he thereby cut himself off from the true Israel, and cast in his lot with the opposing party; while the Sadducees on their part were plotting against the Lord Jesus, and planning His arrest and death, at the very time when, according to their own reckoning, they ought to have been 'purging out the old leaven' in their own homes. Think of the comment we have on such deeds in 'the viper hissings of the House of Annas' in Bab., Pesach. 57a.

We have mentioned that there was one thing notably absent from the table at Our Lord's celebration of the Feast. Nothing whatever is said about the lamb. It was evidently not there, but this is now quite intelligible. The Sadducees were in control of the Temple, and, according to the reckoning current with them, the day for sacrificing the lambs had not yet come. The lamb could not be got, and accordingly the feast had to be kept without it. But the Jew had, especially in Macca-bean times, learned to keep the feast without the lamb, when temple and altar were not available; and when the feast was kept away from Jerusalem, as Christ had kept that of the previous year at Capernaum, it had to be observed without the lamb.

And in the Gospels themselves we seem to have an indication that the offering of the lambs had not taken place. In Mk 14¹² the imperfect tense is used, and the natural meaning is 'when they usually or habitually sacrificed the Passover.' In Lk 22⁷ the translation ought to be, 'when it was necessary to sacrifice the passover.' In each case the phrase quoted is given in explanation of the 'first day of

unleavened bread,' and in neither case is the assertion made that the lambs were actually offered.

On one other occasion at least in the life of Christ there was a notable absence of the lamb. On His presentation in the Temple, Mary's sacrifice was (Lk 2²⁴) 'a pair of turtledoves, or two young pigeons.' We are generally given to understand that this was an indication of the poverty of the family. It may have been so, but even in that it may well have been an arrangement of Divine Providence, for in each case Christ Himself was present, and consequently the lamb was superfluous.

Another point of interest in connexion with the lamb is the fact that the technical designation given to it was 'guph' or 'body' (M., Pesach. x. 3). May it not have been in response to the felt absence of the body, that Christ gave expression to the words (Mt 26²⁶), 'This is my body,' in the institution of His own supper. On other occasions during His ministry He presented Himself as supplying a felt or expressed need.

But why did John follow the Sadducean reckoning, instead of writing in harmony with the already published Synoptics? That he meant to contradict them is hardly credible. The long recognized explanation is evidently the true one. He had a special purpose in view, and that was to emphasize that Christ died at the very time that the Passover lambs were being sacrificed—on the afternoon of the Friday. The contrast was not so apparent in the Synoptics, and so John sets it before us in his Gospel. Paul also grasped the same idea, and in 1 Co 5⁷ clearly announces, 'Christ our passover is sacrificed for us.'

But the Babylonian Talmud (Sanh. 43a), a Pharisaic work, declares that Christ was put to death on 'the evening of the Passover' or the 14th

of Nisan, thus agreeing with John, and this has been considered a difficulty. But in the Talmud, the product of many writers, throughout many centuries, there are a good many cases of chronological confusion. In the second century disputation was pretty keen between Jew and Christian, and as the opinion based on John's narrative was current in the East, the Jews might very well have been willing to accept that position rather than admit that their Law had been so flagrantly violated in the Crucifixion.

John and also Paul emphasize the contrast between Christ, the true Lamb, and the false lambs that were being sacrificed the same hour, but the contrast does not end here, for on the morning of the first day of the week, the priests had to prepare and offer the Omer or Sheaf, as the first-fruits of the coming harvest. It was at that very time that the Risen Lord presented Himself, 'the first-fruits from the dead.' But here again it was the contrast between the false and the True.

Nor is this all. At the very time that Christ arose from the Garden Tomb the remains of the bygone Passover feasts were being burned and disposed of. This applies to the Passover as held on the Thursday night, as the remains of that supper could not be burned on either the Friday or the Saturday (M., Pes. vii. 10), both of these days being Sabbaths. It applies equally to the remains of the Sadducean Passover, eaten on the Friday night, and from which the remains had also to be burned on the Sunday morning. The very fragments of the old and the shadowy, true and false alike, were passing away at the very moment when the Real and Everlasting came to His Own. On the Resurrection Morn type and symbol vanish, and Christ is all in all.

Recent Biblical Archaeology.

BY THE REVEREND J. W. JACK, D.D., GLENFARG, PERTSHIRE.

THERE are further interesting reports by Sir Flinders Petrie regarding discoveries at ancient Gaza (*Tell el Ajjûl*), a city which was ten times the size of Troy, and in the days of Abraham formed a key for trade and commerce between two continents. It stood on a sandstone bluff, adjoining the best harbour in Palestine, but about 2000 B.C. the port silted up, malaria developed, and the new Gaza

arose a few miles to the north. Four successive palaces have now been laid bare in the old city, the first of which dates from about 3000 B.C., as well as a curious place of offering in front of the third one (late Hyksos period), containing dedicated treasures, such as gold armlets, ear-rings, scarabs, and other articles of personal jewellery. In a cemetery of the age of Thutmose III. (c. 1500 B.C.)

some twisted gold ear-rings of the cross-section type (distinctly Western) have been discovered. These are exactly similar to some found in Ireland and England, but this is the first time such a pattern has been met with so far east as Palestine. They are regarded by Sir Flinders as of Irish manufacture, and their presence at Old Gaza shows how widely spread were the connexions in early trade between the different civilizations. In ancient graves in south-west England, there were found some years ago blue beads ('luck-beads') of Egyptian manufacture, which probably came by sea as far back as the time of Tutankhamen (c. 1360 B.C.). A more interesting discovery by Sir Flinders, however, from a Biblical point of view, is a remarkable deposit, dating from about 2500 B.C., connected with some great curse (or *herem*). An alabaster vase, slate dish, two fine basalt tripod stands, an immense quantity of gold and silver articles, and various other things appear to have been smashed up and thrown into a great fire. From the nature of the deposit, it could not have been either loot or a burial, but the execution of vengeance on private property which had to be destroyed for the common good. It is an interesting parallel to the story of Achan (Jos 7), where breach of a taboo involved the whole Israelite host in guilt, and the community had to free itself from guilt by destroying Achan, his family and possessions, by burning. In the discovery at Old Gaza, we have another proof that such an expurgation was an ancient Palestinian custom which came into usage later among the Israelites. Idols, guilty citizens, obnoxious enemies, and, in short, anything evil in itself and distasteful to God, was regarded as *herem* ('devoted to destruction'). Its annihilation was a religious duty and acceptable to God. The city on whose site Hormah was built was made *herem* (Nu 21², Jg 17¹⁷), and other instances are Jabesh-Gilead (Jg 21¹⁰), Jericho (rebuilding forbidden under a curse, Jos 6²⁶), the Amalekites (1 S 15), and the children of Ham at Gedor (1 Ch 4⁴¹). According to the Moabite Stone (l. 16 f.), Mesha made the whole Israelite populace of Nebo *herem* to Ashtarchemosh.

It used to be thought that games of chance and skill were unknown in Palestine till introduced by the Greeks and Romans. The soldiers who, perhaps by means of dice, cast lots for the seamless robe of Jesus, were Romans. But excavations are proving that such games were widespread throughout the East, having their origin probably in Egypt. Some time ago we referred to the discovery of a unique set of playing pieces at *Beit*

Mirsim, in the southern Shephelah of Judah. Mr. C. Leonard Woolley has now discovered at Ur, in Babylonia, a fiddle-shaped slab of steatite, dating from the fourth century B.C., on the flat face of which are engraved concentric circles and rosettes. The object is a gaming-board, resembling those found in Egypt, and it is possible that such games had a religious side ('fortune-telling'), as well as being a pastime. There is every reason to believe that they were as prevalent in Palestine as elsewhere. Both the Gezer plaque (hitherto regarded as an Astarte cult object) and the Gerrar one (found by Petrie), dating probably about the time of Joshua, have peg-holes for small pegs used in a game, and two large holes for fixing them to the wall.

There have been many views expressed by scholars as to the nature of Solomon's litter-bed or palanquin, which seems to have accompanied him on his journeys. We have a graphic picture of it borne by a number of his valiant men (Ca 3^{7a}). Fresh light has now been thrown on the matter by Dr. Reisner's discovery of the golden travelling-bed of Queen Heterperhes I., the mother of Cheops (builder of the great Pyramid). It is a gem of Egyptian craftsmanship nearly five thousand years old, the only complete example known so far. The articles found include not only the canopy, but the bed, head-rest, carrying-chair, and jewel-box placed within it, together with linen of fine quality (now quite decayed) required for the canopy covering or curtains. The canopy, believed to be made of cedar of Lebanon, is composed of twenty-five pieces, joined by tenons and sockets into which these fitted. It measures about ten feet long and about six and a half feet high. It is actually a portable bed-chamber, which can be taken down or set up again in about fifteen minutes, and there can be no doubt that it was transported for the use of the Queen whenever she changed her quarters. The description reminds us forcibly of the picture we refer to in Ca 3, 'Behold, it is Solomon's litter: threescore mighty men are about it . . . he made himself this *appiriôn* ("travelling-bed") of timber of Lebanon. Its pillars he made of silver, its back of gold, its covering of purple.' Was Solomon, who had formed a commercial alliance with Egypt and had married a daughter of the Pharaoh, imitating the customs of that land? At all events, his 'palankeen' seems to have resembled in construction, as well as in richness and magnificence, the Egyptian one now discovered.

The excavations of Pères Mallon and Köppel in the Jordan Valley at *Teleilat Ghassûl* and neigh-

bouring sites on the plains of Moab, to which we referred in our last review, continue to be the subject of much discussion. They reveal ancient buried cities, four miles north of the Dead Sea. According to some scholars, the pottery belongs to the Neolithic and Early Bronze ages, and thus places the period of occupation from prior to 2500 B.C. down to about 2100 B.C. (the time of Abraham), though other scholars would date these cities back to a period of about 6000 B.C., and believe them to have been in ruins long before the time of Abraham. The large number of inscribed objects, consisting of potsherds, pebbles, carved stones, seals, and bricks, which have been discovered, and which bear letters or signs of a crude linear character (frequently in groups), must be of great antiquity (at least six or seven thousand years old), and must have been introduced into the district by the original inhabitants, as they all come from the very lowest stratum. Mallon appears to have no doubts that the markings are genuine attempts at writing at that early date, but they seem rather to bear a resemblance to ancient Sumerian engravings of an artistic or symbolic kind. Some of them, such as the tree or branch, are quite common on Sumerian objects, while others are not unlike those used by ancient potters or lamp decorators. According to Petrie, they are not comparable with any Egyptian signs, and meantime their meaning must be left in abeyance. Whatever the objects were used for, they appear from the number and variety of them to have been in constant use and to have formed part of the daily life of the people. It is doubtful whether these buried cities can be Sodom and Gomorrah, or can by any means be made to coincide with the period of Abraham or his nephew Lot (c. 2100 B.C.). They seem to the writer rather to be contemporary with one of the prehistoric cultures of Babylonia. In one of the buildings unearthed in the second lowest stratum, the walls have been found to be ornamented with pictures, some of them being representations of men or gods in processional order. These pictures must be more ancient than any yet discovered in the Mediterranean region.

It is not generally known that the names Jacob, Joseph, Abraham, and others were in existence long before these patriarchs were born. The name Jacob especially must have been common in the Semitic world in those early ages. A fresh proof of this is furnished by Professor Speiser's discovery of a large number of new tablets at Billah, near Nineveh, dating from the time of Tiglath-pileser (c. 1100 B.C.). Among these is a small letter in a

clay envelope, with the name of the writer on the top of the latter and his address in the lower half. The message deals with a certain amount of goods which have been charged to the writer's dealer at Billah. The name of the dealer contains the element *Yakub* (Jacob), thus adding one more instance to the occurrence of the name in extra-Biblical sources. It is long since Dr. Pinches discovered the name on contract tablets of the time of the Babylonian king Sin-muballit, as early as 2090 B.C. Even the name 'Israel' has also been found on a Babylonian cylinder-seal of the era of Narâm-Sin (c. 2680 B.C.), many hundred years before the patriarch.

New important facts as to the Canaanite language and literature continue to come from an examination of the tablets unearthed at Ras Shamra (Fennel Head, the *Ugarit* of the cuneiform inscriptions), on the coast of Syria. The huge mound, whose total area is ten times as large as that of Megiddo and covers the remains of a large training-college and library, has already yielded remarkable results, thanks to the translations of Virolleaud and other Oriental scholars. There are many correspondences with the Old Testament literature. Thus, at the beginning of one of the epic poems (*Môt and Aleîn*), we read of a goddess, Anat, entering the palace of the king, 'the Father of Years,' an expression which is equivalent to 'the Ancient of Days' in Daniel (7⁹). In another line we have the words, 'I know that Aleîn, the lord, lives, and that Zebul, the lord of the earth exists,' which remind us of Job's statement, 'I know that my Redeemer lives, and that he shall stand up at last upon the earth.' Similarly, the idiomatic words 'the spirit shall rest in my breast' may be compared with Nu 11²⁸, 'the spirit rested upon them.' Aleîn is described as 'he that rideth upon the clouds,' an epithet which corresponds to several Old Testament texts (Is 10¹, 'Behold, the lord rideth upon a swift cloud'; Ps 104³, 'who maketh the clouds his chariot,' etc.). Of five agricultural pictures represented, the first three have to do with the purification of the grain by fire before offering it to God, an operation which explains Lv 2¹⁴ ('Thou shalt offer . . . of thy firstfruits corn in the ear parched with fire'). Though the tablets belong to about the eleventh century B.C., the closest analogies and parallels appear to be with the later books of the Bible, such as Isaiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, and Job, a fact which seems to show that the Canaanite influence on the literature of Israel was late in reaching its climax. The new and rapidly increasing mass of material in these tablets is of

such value that it may revolutionize Hebrew lexicography and the parallels will have to find a place in our future Hebrew dictionaries. The archæology of Palestine has been greatly hampered for lack of writings, principally owing to the fact that papyri have not survived in the climate, and the discovery of these cuneiform tablets is all the more welcome.

The American excavators at Megiddo are making large use of balloon-photography as an aid to recording the ruins progressively exposed, and as a help in distinguishing excavated buildings of one stratum from those of another. The balloon is made of thoroughly solid rubberized silk, and the photographs are taken by an electrical release, controllable from the ground, which trips the camera-shutter. Such photographs taken on a still morning have turned out to be satisfactory in every way, and are in constant use on the 'dig' and in the drawing office. Another contrivance which the excavators have found useful is an extensible ladder, of the type used for cleaning high street-lamps, which winds up to a height of over thirty feet, and gives a good view of a considerable area. Fitted with stout guy-ropes, it has been found to be safe even in a fairly strong breeze. The whole summit of the Megiddo mound, except

what is required for dumping on, is being slowly and scientifically excavated, and remarkable discoveries are expected in a year or two when the lower strata are reached.

It has been said that, from the archæological point of view, Palestine is relatively poor. Certainly, there have been fewer spectacular discoveries there than have recently been made in Babylonia or Egypt. But it must be remembered that the numerous excavations going on outside Palestine illustrate and supplement in a most remarkable way our conceptions of the religious life of the Israelites and the other early inhabitants of that land. Valuable results of this nature are expected from new excavations which have been commenced by the German Archæological Institute at Boghaz Keui, the ancient Hittite capital, in which thousands of cuneiform inscriptions were discovered in 1907 by Turkish and German archæologists. The citadel of Büyü-k-kale is being unearthed first, under the direction of R. Bittel, and a number of tablets have already been found, though not in their original positions, but used as rubble. It is possible that further light may be thrown on the vexed question of the Habiru, the races and cities in Palestine in the time of Joshua, and similar matters.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Goethe on Religion.

It is only the other day that we had Mr. H. W. Nevinston's study of *Goethe as Man and Poet*, and before that Miss Stawell and Mr. Dickinson had given us their penetrating exposition of Faust. Herr Franz¹ does not take account of either French or English criticism, however; it is his fellow-Germans with whom he is concerned, and he offers a new appreciation of the subject which sometimes challenges current verdicts upon Goethe's piety. He claims to have presented the evidence critically, for example, to distinguish between Goethe's own opinions and those which were to some extent moulded by the correspondents to whom he was writing in his letters. Again, he premises that Goethe is to be taken seriously as a philosopher,

¹ *Goethe als religiöser Denker*, by Professor Erich Franz (Mohr, Tübingen, 1931. M.10).

and not simply as an eclectic thinker. Thirdly, he emphasizes his personality. These prolegomena occupy pp. 1-61. The third point tallies with a need often felt in estimating Shakespeare's religious position, namely, the allowance for the dramatic element; but in Goethe's case it is specially vital if, as Herr Franz argues, we are not to take even the *Confessions of a Fair Soul*, for example, as a transcript of the real Goethe at every point. The caution displayed by the author in handling the sources, even a source like *Dichtung und Wahrheit*, inspires confidence in his method.

Rightly he begins with an important matter, the place of irony in Goethe (62-108). One could have wished that he had considered the famous essay of Thirlwall in relation to the function of irony in religion, or Jowett's account of irony in Plato. It is a wide subject. There is irony even in the Gospels as in the OT prophets and in St. Paul.

Goethe's irony was instinctive, and emerges in his treatment of religion as well as of philosophy and human conduct, and in his sense of the illusions which meet the serious person; the literary expression of most significance is found in the *Divan*, *Faust*, and *Wilhelm Meister*. It varies in tone, but Herr Franz shows how it persisted from youth to age in the career of 'the old pagan,' just because he was really far more than a pagan. In its most emphatic form, that is, so far as negation goes, the monologue of Prometheus is properly selected as typical, with its exposure of an anthropomorphic deity.

The chapter on irony and reverence contains an acute analysis of the famous passage on the three reverences (pp. 114 f.). It is a much disputed point whether the third reverence which recognizes 'humility and poverty, mockery and despite, disgrace and wretchedness, suffering and death' (to quote Carlyle's version) as divine, refers to a veneration 'of the contradictory, the hated and avoided,' or to a respect for those who are suffering and sad and depressed in the eyes of mankind, so far as religion is concerned. The text is ambiguous and compressed. Herr Franz thinks that Goethe considered Christianity as only a form, though the most frequent form, of the religious type which honoured poverty and suffering. He had deep sympathy with those who shared this feeling, but he did not identify religion with such a Christian type any more than he meant by 'the under' region the numinous. Other chapters on religious psychology, the history of religion, and religious philosophy exhibit the author's command of his subject. He avoids the easy mistake of turning Goethe's references to religion into a system. This is particularly noticeable in his excellent discussion of the three types, the philosophical, the ethnic, and the Christian (pp. 215 f.). He notes, for example, how fond Goethe was of emphasizing that religious convictions in an individual were not transferable (p. 229), and how his religious philosophy was never an objective metaphysic or a speculation upon the Absolute, much as he shrank from anything like anthropomorphism. He would have had no sympathy with theories like those of Dilthey or Spengler or Steiner in modern times. There is a specially interesting discussion of the relation between Goethe and the Dialectic theology (pp. 246 f.), which is of interest to more than German readers. Goethe, the author thinks, would have been in sympathy with the contention of reverence for the Absolute God, but he could not have agreed with the tendency to identify the

deity with any 'X' quantity. Did he not himself say, 'It would not be worth while to live for seventy years if the wisdom of this world were no more than foolishness with God'? His idealism is in hopeless antagonism to any system of irrational paradoxes, even though St. Paul, Luther, and Kierkegaard are invoked in its favour.

A few pages upon the personal faith of Goethe conclude this illuminating monograph (pp. 252 f.). He was not primarily interested in religion, nor did he give away his religious secrets. He eschewed sects and dogmas, but he disliked the dualism, the transcendence, and the ethics of Christianity. He was a pious pagan of the ancient type, Herr Franz thinks; what fascinated him always was the sense of the divine in Nature, a sort of *hylozoism*, which produced an optimism of its own, an optimism which led him to avoid pain and suffering as far as possible. 'We bid you hope'—*wir heissen euch hoffen*—is his last word, and with it Herr Franz closes his analysis. In this respect, as in some others, the nearest parallel to Goethe is George Meredith, whom Herr Franz does not seem to know. Goethe's real religion is a courageous belief in Nature as the source of joy and hope and strength. And—this Herr Franz does note—he owed such a faith in Nature to his scientific training, which enabled him to advance beyond the position of a man to whom in early days he owed so much—that is, Lessing.

Sin and Reality.

THE title may sound technical, but Dr. Hirsch claims to have written with the non-theological reader in mind, and he has not been unsuccessful in his effort to argue in the light of modern thought. This is the first of the 'Beiträge zur Systematischen Theologie,' but, while it is thorough, it is not unduly technical in language. It is refreshingly clear of scholastic terminology, without being 'popular' in the lower sense of the term.

In some lines which breathe an unwonted fervour Pope once wrote :

Heavens ! Was I born for nothing but to write ?
Has life no joys for me ? or (to be grave)
Have I no friend to serve, no soul to save ?

Dr. Hirsch¹ seriously raises the last of these questions. He faces the modern situation, with

¹ *Schöpfung und Sünde in der natürlich-geschichtlichen Wirklichkeit des einzelnen Menschen*, by Dr. Emanuel Hirsch (Mohr, Tübingen, 1931. M.6.60).

its passionate emphasis upon human freedom, which seems to have upset the traditional conceptions of the religious life. Especially is this the case with humanism, or, as Dr. Hirsch prefers to call it, rationalism, as it appears in modern Germany. The hope of life, he insists, lies in recognizing man's relationship to God, and this involves the fundamental issue, how is man to be regarded as at once created and sinful, a part of the divine order and yet out of line with the divine will? To the psychological analysis of this consciousness the author addresses himself in these closely knit pages. The underlying principle of the discussion is that men are God's creation in a double sense of the term, passively, as owing their being to Him, actively, as obeying the laws and leading of His spirit in their personalities. Religion means that the individual's relationship to God, his consciousness of the divine, at once renders him truly himself and reveals the truth that the centre of his being lies not in himself but in Another, whom he worships as his Creator and Lord. Yet there is an inner unrest which witnesses to some abnormal element in human personality (pp. 25 f.). Man's 'freedom' discloses itself as rebellious or critical of God. This is termed 'sin,' not because it is an incident, but because it refers to the entire personality. Existence reveals both freedom and this antagonism, personality actively energetic and at the same time handicapped or thwarted by itself in the world of aspiration and experience. The solution of this riddle is to be sought in the reconciling grace of God, which alone accounts for both relationships and experiences (pp. 39 f.), by revealing the realization of life through Jesus Christ in His spirit of love. Here the new and true relationship of man to God is shown, lifting him above the strain of his ties to the natural order and to his own incompetence. He has a soul to save, by accepting the original purpose of God in creation, as revealed through Christ. In God's Word or revelation the guarantee of this is to be found, Dr. Hirsch argues. God's truth or reality is known only through a knowledge of this purpose, and the very experience of sin or of incompatibility with the true end of life is one divine means of awakening the sense of what life is intended to be in His order. In handling the problem of sin, Dr. Hirsch reminds one of Martineau; there is the same power of conveying thought in moving language that is not splashy, and much the same religious insight into the fact that sin within the human personality is something worse than a mere failure to realize one's ideals. Dr. Hirsch's way of putting it is that sin represents

the narrowing and stinting of that freedom which is intended to be the full growth of personality as created, and consequently that the realization of personality involves not merely the exhibition in Christ of the ideal but a dealing with the contrary fact of sin, which is the content of grace divine.

But 'I have a friend to serve' is the other side of 'I have a soul to save,' or, rather, to allow God to save. While the personality reaches after freedom of development, this is not possible except in fellowship, in ethical relations with one's fellows; the norm of this is, according to Dr. Hirsch (pp. 77 f.), found in love, 'the fulfilling of the law.' As 'the deepest fulness of God means that He will not live without men, even without sinful men,' so the real man is directed to saving relations with his fellow-creatures. At this point the author meets the problem of the Christian ethic in relation to the specific ethical ideals and practices of civilization, a problem which he has handled in his *Die idealistische Philosophie und das Christenthum* (1926, pp. 30 f.) and *Die Liebe zum Vaterlande* (fourth edition, 1930). He deprecates any shrinking from the common duties of life, as if that were the way to higher spiritual progress, while at the same time he lays emphasis upon the religious root of all Christian ethic. One of his criticisms of Christian socialism is that it tends to identify Christian love with the interests of one class, the proletariat, and also fails to maintain the religious motives of Christianity because the proletariat object to any reference to the next world. It is one thing to be a loveless bourgeois, quite another thing to be a real Christian who refuses to confine his duty of love to one section or to narrow it for the sake of currying favour with Demos. The Lutheran note is sounded loudly at this point.

A final chapter on the divine judgment (pp. 103 f.) brings out the need of such a conception in genuine Christianity; otherwise the moral responsibility of man as a created being and as a sinner is imperfectly realized. The holiness of God is to be reckoned with, as man views his relations to others and to the divine law and love. Again, there is, as in Hermann, a constant endeavour to restate the truth in relation to the teaching of Luther.

Dr. Hirsch is frank and fresh in meeting all manner of possible objections to his argument. Even where one cannot quite follow him, one is sensible that he is not arguing for argument's sake, nor evading those who do not share his point of view. This quality, together with the remarkable union of mental acuteness and religious feeling, to which I have already referred, makes his treatise

a refreshment to the mind. After reading Mr. F. H. Bradley's *Appearance and Reality*, some one said that the only thing Bradley's Reality seemed to do was to appear. Dr. Hirsch is conscious that any Reality which a Christian conceives does more than appear; it acts. The pervading sense of this activity, which he prefers to call the grace of God, is the source of his philosophy and of the singularly impressive statement which he gives of its moral and spiritual implications.

Origen Re-interpreted.

DR. VÖLKER has written a most stimulating monograph,¹ the thesis of which is that Origen ought not to be viewed as a speculative, idealistic philosopher who resolved the current conceptions of the Church into a philosophy of religion, as though he were a Leibniz, but as the man who first stated with effect the mystical, ascetic ideal of practical 'perfection' in Christianity. In other words, the contention is that Origen is to be understood in the light of the later monastic movement rather than as the pioneer of Christianized Hellenism. This is not entirely a novel view; it has been voiced already. But Dr. Völker has the merit of having stated it at full length, adducing careful and comprehensive evidence from the writings of the great Alexandrian. He is obliged to differ seriously from writers like Harnack and Bigg, to mention two of the leading exponents of the other theory; but his criticisms are not merely negative, they are based upon an examination of Origen's teaching which brings to light, according to him, the data that justify his appreciation. After a discussion of criticism up to date, in which almost the only omission is that of any reference to Dr. Patrick's work, he proceeds to analyse the problem of Christian 'perfection' as Origen found it (22-75). That Origen was in closer touch with actual or average Christian life than Clement ever was, has been long recognized. But Dr. Völker endeavours to show that in handling the question of the Christian aim, he was at once nearer to the interests of the NT period and at the same time removed from that period by his acceptance of ascetic tendencies which were supposed to be the clue to freedom from the sins and passions of the flesh. The interest which he felt in these tendencies was due to his practical sympathy with Christians who were

having a hard time in the flesh as they strove to live in the Spirit. The dominating conception for him was that of the Christian life as a strife against God or for God, and it was to this vital interest rather than to any purely speculative aim that he owed his predilection for ascetic principles like celibacy. At this point (pp. 53 f.) Dr. Völker might have added the evidence of the uncanonical Acts of the Apostles in the second century, which often seem to suggest that the main object of the gospel is to suspend sexual relations between married people, so deeply had this tendency sunk into the Christian mind. But he brings out from other quarters the desire, with which Origen sympathized, to state perfection for the Christian as attainable through mystic visions and ascetic practices. The evidence from Origen's own treatises is put with a force which certainly justifies a modification in the views of recent scholars like De Faye and Harnack. The second chapter deals with the 'gnostic' affinities (76-144) of this position. A warning is given not to confine one's attention to the *De Principiis*. In the Homilies, for example (104 f.), the mystical interest appears as a method of practical progress for the Christian. As the soul of Christ is alone perfect, the Christian must reproduce this, and the reproduction is only possible through the love-relationship which the mystical union with Christ the Bridegroom offers. Certainly Dr. Völker is right in drawing a parallel here between Origen and the gnostics, for in Valentinus the bridal-idea is well marked. But the Alexandrian further sees that the direct vision of God, which is the perfect state, is specially reserved for the 'spiritual' soul and for the martyr. Only, Dr. Völker pleads, we must not regard Origen as yielding involuntarily to mystical tendencies as he seeks to elaborate a logical system of belief, but as really interested in mysticism with its accompanying asceticism. The third chapter (145-196) on the practical or active life contains the heart of the treatise. The controlling ethical idea of 'perfection' is the Christian conflict with sin and the flesh, which Origen fills out with his new ideas; the conflict includes opposition to the evil spirits in worldly science as well as in heresy, but even so the 'perfect' spiritual man, in virtue of his attainments, is ahead of the bishops (pp. 181 f.). Indeed, his prototype is the apostles, so highly does Origen view the function of the perfect Christian. In the fourth chapter (197-228) prayer and the imitation of Christ are discussed; the real imitation of Christ, which the 'perfect' Christian seeks, is an ascetic discipline, including poverty and

¹ *Das Vollkommenheitsideal des Origenes*, by Walther Völker ('Beiträge zur Historischen Theologie,' 7; Mohr, Tübingen, 1931).

humility. Origen here is declared to be the pioneer of the later monasticism, although, as Dr. Völker admits, the other monastic virtues of chastity and obedience are less to the front. But helpful charity and mystical experiences are recognized as parts of the real imitation. Dr. Völker closes his book by repeating that most scholars have been misled by devoting too much attention to the *De Principiis* (226 f.), whereas in Origen's other works the engrossing interest in the Person of Christ as the real aim and inspiration of the Christian life is richly recognized.

Few more stimulating treatises upon Origen

have been written than this, and as a result it will be needful to correct some of the current estimates of his theological position. In the course of the argument there are many incidental discussions which the historian of early Christianity will find fruitful, e.g. the paragraphs on humility (61), ecstasy (139), bread and wine (140), the festival of the Christian life (150), 'apathy' (154), martyrdom (156 f.), sinlessness (163 f.), the Church (182 f.), Scripture (183 f.), and the priesthood of Christians (187 f.). I mention these because the book has no index.

JAMES MOFFATT.

New York.

Robinson Crusoe as the Prodigal Son.

BY THE REVEREND W. H. STUBBS, B.A., CHORLTON-CUM-HARDY, MANCHESTER.

THE story of Robinson Crusoe is written out of the wisdom which matures in the hearts of those who have returned from their wilful wanderings in the 'Far Country.' Countless books have been written on spiritual experience, its history and development. Many have written the story of their sin and repentance, or their search for peace. The outstanding examples which readily occur to the mind are *The Imitation of Christ*, by Thomas à Kempis, Augustine's *Confessions*, and Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*. But these have not been popular books, save with the devout. Bunyan's work, of course, is outstanding in its dramatic quality. He gave to the abstract the interest of the concrete. He dramatized the spiritual life. But it was the Master of story-tellers who gave us the greatest story of this kind in the Parable of the Prodigal Son. Defoe must have written his story with the Parable of the Prodigal Son as a background. He not only invented the realistic novel, but he gave us the spiritual theme in a new setting, imbedded in a tale of romantic adventure, so realistic that it has captured the imagination of the world. The story is built into a framework of spiritual development, the outline of which can be easily traced in the reflections of the chief character.

We have never regarded *Robinson Crusoe* as a religious book. This is due, perhaps, to the fact that Defoe was such a realist. His romantic interest ran away with the story. But the book is deeply religious, and spiritual values are treasured throughout. There is a thrilling inner story. There is an adventure within an adventure.

Defoe, who was trained for the ministry, defended his book, when his dissenting friends attacked it on the ground that it was untrue, by maintaining that the story was an allegory. He claimed that he wrote his books to show that there was a way of salvation for sinners in this life if they would only repent. That purpose runs strongly through the book we are considering.

In our boyhood, we skipped the 'dry bits' and hurried on breathlessly with the story. But we have gone back to the book many times since, and now the 'dry bits' are marked passages. We have read them many, many times, and our eyes are not always dry in the reading. As we read, we feel that we are reading another version of the 'Prodigal Son' with the detail filled in. Let us trace the spiritual theme through the story, going back over what we, in our early years, read so hurriedly and thoughtlessly.

Robinson Crusoe was born in a Christian home. His father, a wise and grave man, was kind and tolerant. The station of life in which the family lived was comfortable, but it became too restricted for the growing boy. Youth surged lustily in him. His parents were old, and life at home was dull. He refused to be apprenticed to any trade and wished to go to sea. His father, with tears streaming down his face, reasoned with him, and pleaded in gentle terms to desist. For a time, these entreaties held him. But lusting for the lands beyond the setting sun and the life which men lived in wilder parts, he sought again and again through his mother to win the parental consent to his pro-

posed adventure. Warnings were lost upon him. Wisdom could not persuade him. Tears and entreaties could not hold him. So 'he took his journey into a far country.' He ran away to sea. While on a visit to Hull, a companion provided him with the opportunity he had long sought. He was offered a passage to London. 'In an evil hour, and without asking God's blessing, or his father's consent,' he embarked upon his adventures. But they were no sooner out of the harbour than the wind began to blow, and the waves to rise in a frightful manner. He became sick in body and terrified in mind. As the storm increased in fury, he became repentant for his rash action: 'That if it would please God to spare my life in this one voyage, I would never set foot in a ship again, I would go home to my father and never run myself into such miseries again.' But the storm abated, and so did the repentance of Crusoe. He joined in a bowl of punch with the sailors, 'And in that one night's wickedness I drowned all my repentance, all my reflections upon my conduct, all my resolutions for the future.' Later, the ship was wrecked off Yarmouth, but the crew escaped. Crusoe says, 'Had I now the sense to have gone home, I had been happy, and my father, an emblem of our blessed Saviour's parable, had even killed for me the fatted calf.'

We pass over his adventures until we come on him later, upon the uninhabited island. No serious religious reflections are recorded until he discovered those few shoots of corn outside his cave dwelling. 'It is impossible,' he says, 'to express the astonishment and confusion of my thoughts on this occasion. I had hitherto acted upon no religious foundation at all. Indeed, I had very few religious notions in my head . . . but after I saw barley grow there—it startled me strangely, and I began to suggest that God had miraculously caused His grain to grow without any seed sown.'

In this way his mind became opened out to the thought of God's providence and care. It is true that his thankfulness abated somewhat when he discovered the real cause of the corn's appearance. But from now on there is a deeper note in his reflections, and he is brought more and more into contact with the thought of God.

But it needed something more than God's providence to awaken his soul. The Prodigal does not come to himself when things are prospering with him. It needs something more than the terror of an earthquake shock even. The soul must be visited with conviction of sin. The sinner is hardened in his ways and it needs a storm of passion

in his soul which will leave him spent and naked before God. Listen to the man who has not yet come to the place of tears. 'After the third shock was over . . . I began to take courage . . . all this while I had no religious thought, nothing but the common "Lord, have mercy upon me."'

The spiritual crisis of his life came some time later in the midst of his illness. Frightened to death with the apprehensions of his condition, he prayed to God, for the first time since the storm off Hull. Weak and light-headed for days, he slept fitfully, then he had a terrifying vision. 'I saw a man descend from a great black cloud, in a bright flame of fire . . . when he stepped upon the earth, I thought the ground trembled. He moved towards me, with a long spear or weapon in his hand, and I heard a terrible voice say, "Seeing all these things have not brought thee to repentance, now thou shalt die." At which words, I thought that he lifted up the spear to kill me.' This vision drove him to his knees in prayer. But, 'Alas! I had no Divine knowledge. What I had received from my father was then worn out by an uninterrupted series of eight years of sea-faring wickedness, and a constant conversation with none but such as were like myself—wicked and profane in the last degree.' But there is a note of sincerity in his cry: 'Lord, be Thou my help, for I am in great distress.' In his weakness, and after recovering somewhat from the terror of the vision, he struggled to provide himself with food—'This was the first bit of food I had ever asked God's blessing to, even as I could remember, in my whole life.'

It was while searching for some tobacco that he came upon one of the Bibles which he had brought from the wreck. He opened the Bible and came upon the words, 'Call upon me in the day of trouble, and I will answer thee.' The words were so apt to his case that they made a profound impression upon him and led, doubtless, to the act of prayer which followed soon after: 'I kneeled down, and prayed to God, to fulfil the promise to me.' From this time onwards, he read the book continually and seriously. 'I was earnestly begging God to give me repentance when it chanced that reading the Bible, I came upon these words: "He is exalted a Prince and Saviour, to give repentance and remission." He threw down the book, and with heart and hands raised to heaven he cried aloud and prayed. 'Now I prayed with a sense of my condition and a true Scripture view of hope, founded on the encouragement of the word of God.'

It was thus that the Prodigal came to himself

and found his way with many tears back to his father's house. From this point in the narrative there are scattered reflections which indicate a change of heart. It is not the same Crusoe who talks. He is a new man. With the change of heart all things are changed. He sees God's hand in all things. The island becomes a place of beauty. He is no longer a rebel. The spirit of reconciliation working in his heart and turning him with new emotions to the love and goodness of God has its accompaniment in a happier frame of mind. 'It was now that I began to feel how much more happy this life I now led was, with all its miserable circumstances, than the wicked life I led all the past part of my days. My very desires altered. My affections changed their gust, and my delights were perfectly new.'

The thought of his loneliness was always with him. Before he came to himself, he had been very bitter and resentful about it. But gradually he came to bear it bravely. He could not bring himself to thank God for his privations, yet he could say: 'I sincerely thanked God for opening my eyes by whatever afflicting providence to see the former condition of my life, and to mourn for my wickedness and repent.' In this frame of mind he is led to make a sane reflection about happiness: 'All our discontents about what we want appeared to me to spring from the want of thankfulness for what we have.'

The story of the discovery of the footprints in the sand is one of the master strokes of literature. Not even the old goat, dying in the cave, terrified Crusoe so much as this suggestion of possible enemies. His mind was tormented with all kinds of fears, among which the Devil played a prominent part. His fears banished all his former confidence in God. But the reality of his conversion was soon to reassert itself. 'One morning, lying in bed, and filled with thoughts about my danger from the appearance of the savages, I found it decomposed me very much, upon which these words from the Scripture came to my mind: "Call upon me in the day of trouble, and I will deliver thee, and thou shalt glorify me." Upon this, rising cheerfully, my heart was not only comforted, but I was guided to pray for deliverance . . . it is impossible to express the comfort this gave me. In answer, I laid down the book and was no more sad.'

We recall the rescue of Friday from the hands of the savages and the opportunity which it gave to Crusoe not only of companionship, but also the chance of becoming a schoolmaster and evangelist to the untutored heathen. He questioned Friday

about his religious beliefs and the beliefs of his people. 'From these things,' says Crusoe, 'I began to instruct him in the true knowledge of God.' He claimed to be so successful in this, that later he could say, 'The savage was now a good Christian, a much better one than I.' Space will not permit to point out the fairness and Christian generosity with which he treated people in after years, and the charity which he showed to his sisters, and those who, during his absence, had been faithful to his interests.

It was in such a way that Defoe represented the homecoming of the soul to God, and into the service of his fellows. From one stage to another we see him passing through the experiences which are common among the children of God, and to the acceptance of Divine Grace as they are ministered by His Spirit. The pilgrim's journey home is always a subject of interest among us, but seldom has it been presented in such a colourful way as this. There is infinite variety in the setting of our spiritual pilgrimage, but the theme is always the same. Each of us could write of the time when we ran away to sea in some form or another! We could tell of the things which turned our thoughts towards home. The stories would be different in their setting and their detail, but they would be the same in essence and reality. 'All we like sheep have gone astray, we have turned each one to his own way,' is the mode in which Isaiah tells the story, but when we turn in true repentance we find a love that gathers us pityingly to itself, and there is rejoicing among the angels of God over our repentance.

We take final leave of Crusoe at the end of the narrative in words which fill us with a sense of satisfaction, and yet with strange, thrilling emotions as they turn our thoughts in a new direction to the greatest adventure of all.

'And here, resolving to harass myself no more, I am preparing for a longer journey than all these, having lived seventy-two years a life of infinite variety, and learned sufficiently to know the value of retirement and the blessing of ending our days in peace.'

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.